

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN view of the great demonstration to be held in favour of disarmament on the eleventh of this month, at which the leaders of the three political parties are expected to speak, in view also of the international conference to be held next February—a conference which may well be of incalculable importance for the future history of the world—we make no apology for returning to a book which we briefly noticed in these columns a few months ago by Professor G. J. HEERING, of the University of Leyden, and which is introduced in a Foreword by the Rev. Dr. Hector MACPHERSON.

The book bears the rather unfortunate and in some respects misleading title *The Fall of Christianity* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). It would have been better to replace this title, which does little to suggest the real subject of the book, and which might well cause it to be overlooked by those who would profit most from its perusal, by the sub-title, *A Study of Christianity, the State, and War*. The chief title appears to have been chosen to suggest the peril to which Christianity is exposed, when the Church becomes too deeply implicated in the fortunes of the State, as it has tended to do ever since the days of Constantine.

The book is in essence a very able argument against war as entirely incompatible with the gospel of Jesus Christ; but its value is enhanced by a long historical discussion on 'Primitive Christianity and War,' which reviews the ethic of the New Testament

and the teaching of the Christian Fathers, and traces the development of ecclesiastical opinion from an original antagonism to war and militarism to tolerance and finally to definite support. This historical discussion is followed by a sketch of the philosophical influences, notably in Germany, which helped to create the political atmosphere that was to some extent at least responsible for the catastrophe which broke upon the world in 1914.

Machiavelli, Luther, Calvin, Hegel, Fichte, and others are passed in review, and their contribution to the creation of opinion on the subjects of War and the State are carefully noted and discussed by a mind which we feel at every point to be peculiarly sensitive to Christian values and resolutely eager to maintain them. It will be no surprise to students of history that it is the humanists rather than the theologians who are opposed on principle to war. It is Erasmus who says: 'Things have come to such a pass that to open one's mouth against war is actually regarded as immoral and unchristian.'

The real crux of the matter lies of course in the relation of the individual to the State. Are there two moralities—one for the State and one for the individual? Is the State free, in certain exigencies, to do what the Christian or even the merely scrupulous individual would not permit himself to do: and—what is still more important—has the State the right to compel him, in such circumstances, to act against his conscience? It is here that

Dr. HEERING's discussion of the political philosophers is luminous and valuable.

The arguments of some of them led to the practical apotheosis of the State. Hegel, for example, regarding the State as the most significant expression of the Universal Spirit, argues that it has no higher duty than to maintain itself, and, for this, power is indispensable. The higher righteousness reveals itself in the will of the State, and to this the individual must be subservient. On this Meinecke makes the suggestive comment: 'So came to pass the new monstrosity, namely, that Machiavellianism was inserted *into* the context of an idealist philosophy which included and endorsed all the values of ethics, whereas formerly it had been obliged to lead its life *outside* the moral order which man had built himself.'

Other thinkers, however, dispensing with this philosophical defence, reach practically the same goal by frankly admitting that there are two standards of ethics, one pagan, the other Christian, and that both are necessary. Let us hear the great socialist preacher Friedrich Naumann: 'Both are necessary to life,' he says, 'the mailed fist and the hand of Jesus. The State is pagan, its demands are pagan, but not on that account immoral. It is another ethic, as inevitable as the Christian ethic.' But there is surely here an antinomy, which the consistent Christian thinker must feel it his duty to resolve.

Is the truth not rather that moral ends can never be promoted by immoral means? The spiritual values of which a nation is the custodian cannot be transmitted to the future if they are remorselessly trampled upon in time of war. 'Realpolitik,' as it is called, fails in the end, just because it is not 'real' enough. It does not take sufficient account of the future, it does not understand that it is moral forces that determine the ultimate issue: in short, it does not believe in the moral order. It has no appreciation of the fact that, if there is to be an order at all in human affairs, it must be a *moral* order; any attempt to create an order on any other basis—on the basis, for example, of cunning or

force—can end in nothing but dispeace and chaos. Or, to state the case in the language of religion, it fails, as it is bound to fail, because it does not believe in God. It does not understand the truth put so trenchantly by Isaiah, that '*He also is wise.*'

The case against the cruelty, the wickedness, the stupidity of war is put with terrible realism by Dr. HEERING. He reminds us—and we need to be reminded—that it is impossible to humanize war, the attempt, which does more credit to the heart than to the head, is as impossible as would be the attempt to humanize the tiger. Early in the Great War two thousand five hundred British sailors were sent to their death in a few minutes by the sinking of three cruisers. The sooner we recognize that such things constitute the essence of war, the more likely we shall be to turn to a more humane way for the settling of international disputes. To the chemical horrors of the last war will in all likelihood be added, if possible, more appalling horrors of bacterial warfare in the next war, should there ever be another. A generation is rising up that knows nothing of these things, and it is well that they should not be forgotten.

But war carries in its train other consequences not less terrible, perhaps indeed more so. As someone has said, the first casualty to fall in war is truth. Misrepresentation and falsehood are not incidental; they are integral to the prosecution of it. Again, the rights of personality are ignored; each man is but a pawn in the cruel game, his only right being to 'do and die,' but on no account to 'reason why'—that is the monstrous demand of war. And again reprisals are inevitable. Combatants are driven to do what they abhor themselves for doing, with the result that moral values, for the defence of which war is usually, at least by one group of the combatants, ostensibly undertaken, are trampled in the dust.

It is good to be able to believe that there are in every land men, however few, who even in the direst straits are prepared to uphold the moral ideal and who would refuse at any price to sacrifice it to political expediency—men like Professor Kohn-

stamm (quoted by Dr. HEERING) who says: 'There are things which I hope the Dutch nation would never do, even though it must go to pieces for declining them.' In truth, however, the moral constitution of the world is such that nations like these are little likely to go to pieces. This is the truth that sustained Habakkuk when he said, 'The just *shall live* by his faithfulness,' and it is the truth re-asserted two and a half millennia later by Professor Foerster when he says: 'Only those states shall live which are determined for the sake of righteousness to die. For Providence will not let those nations die which try to live with moral and spiritual power like this, by the deepest revelations and proclamations of truth which man has received. for out of them may be built up something higher than the life and society of the beasts.'

There are welcome signs in these days that Christian thinkers are more disposed than formerly to concentrate attention upon the Word of God. Behind all questions of literary and historical criticism, which have too much occupied the Christian mind of our time, there is at the heart of the gospel a veritable Word of God, a Divine message, a *kerugma* which it is the mission of the preacher to proclaim, and the function of theology to explore and express. The Christian message, though it presents many problems, is not primarily an addition to our problems. It is 'Good News of God, a revelation of the character of God in which is to be found the answer to those questions which are every man's concern.' The influence of the Barthian school is doubtless to be traced in this increased emphasis on the Word of God, though more generally it may be regarded as a natural and healthy reaction of the Christian spirit, which feels the need of strongly reaffirming its central message in face of the radical criticism of the age. In these matters no saner guide can be found than Dr. Sydney CAVE, the President of the Cheshunt College, Cambridge, to whose teaching many owe a deep debt. He has now published a volume on *The Doctrines of the Christian Faith* (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net), in which he sets himself to answer

the question, 'What is the Word of God, and how can we declare it?'

Dr. CAVE comments on the curious dislike for theology expressed in many quarters. 'The contempt for theology felt by those outside the Church need occasion no surprise,' for the theologian, like the preacher, must be content to appear 'a fool for Christ's sake.' What is surprising is the dislike felt for theology by many within the Church, and not least by some who themselves are preachers of the gospel. For what is Christian theology but the systematic attempt to explore more fully and express more adequately that Christian message which the preacher is set apart to proclaim. Yet preachers have been known even to boast of their ignorance of theology. 'We do not find students in other faculties boasting of their ignorance. They would be afraid, if they did, of being accused of idleness or of incompetency.'

The dislike for theology, however, is not restricted to the mentally indolent. In the general unsettlement of thought following upon the War many believers are driven to feel that the only path of safety for them is to fall back on a bold reaffirmation of Protestant orthodoxy or a revival of Medievalism when faith and reason seemed to be united and men were, as it is believed, untroubled by the perplexities which distress our generation. Others, perhaps a more numerous company, take the opposite course. 'In their natural revolt against the excessive dogmatism of an earlier age, they have an aversion to any definite statement. They feel the appeal of Christ's character. They prize what they call the simple Christianity of the Sermon on the Mount. But they do not desire to go on to ask, Who was that Man who spoke with such decisive force, and what is the content and authority of His revelation of God, and of man's nature and destiny? They prefer half-tones and neutral phrases, and, if they had their way, they would reduce the preacher's message to the record of his own devout impressions.'

For the Christian preacher, however, the choice does not lie between having a theology and having

none at all. It lies between having a theology which is good and having a theology which is bad. 'A theology is good or bad according to the measure in which it worthily interprets the Christian Gospel.' Judged by this standard all theologies have not been good. Some have been too academic, too exclusively occupied with the controversies of the past, 'with the result that many a young minister has turned away with weariness from the study of theology, believing that it has as its chief concern, not the exploration of the gospel, but the discussion of abstruse problems in which as a preacher he has no interest.' But we cannot rid ourselves of false theologies by the simple device of having no theology at all. 'The great problems of life and destiny are too solemn and urgent to be for long evaded. If the preacher is to speak, and not merely to mumble, he must have something to say in answer to them.' He has to confirm the faith of those within the Church who are perplexed, and he can only do that by fairly meeting their doubts and difficulties. He has to preach the gospel to those who are outside the Church, and to relate it to the problems which are stirring men's minds in a world that is largely pagan. 'They are problems which concern the meaning of the universe, and the value and permanence of our human lives. And these problems are only variant forms of that first and final problem, is there a God, and, if so, what is He like and what is the secret of His rule?' In dealing with these problems theology deals with the most practical of all themes, and is essential to the due fulfilment of the preacher's work.

If the prime concern of theology is the revelation of God in Christ received by faith, then it is evident that there can be no final theology. For our knowledge of God's revelation is imperfect, our appropriation of it is incomplete, and the categories in which we seek to express it are transient and local. 'Truth is one, but the approaches to it are many. A true theology and a true philosophy would agree in their conclusions. But the method of theology is different from that of philosophy. Philosophy works upward from the consideration of man and the universe. Christian theology has for its first concern the exploration of the revelation of God in Christ

known by believing men.' Now this revelation is a revelation of God active in man's salvation, a personal revelation which can only be known by that personal response which we call faith. Faith, then, is an organ of knowledge, the knowledge of God, for we come to know God, not by an act of bare cognition, but by our experience of His saving influence. This knowledge of faith, it should be observed, gives us assurance only in regard to faith's immediate utterances. It does not guarantee the truth of our theories or the correctness of our inferences. 'Faith may know with certainty that God has spoken to us in Christ, and has in Him brought us into the relationship of children to their Father. But the Christian experience of God revealed as Father, through the Son and in the Spirit, is one thing. A theological statement of the doctrine of the Trinity is another. The first is an immediate utterance of Christian faith; the second is an ultimate implicate, an attempt to give to faith's immediate utterance a coherent expression.'

Yet we are compelled to give some coherent expression to our faith. We cannot isolate our religious thought; we must relate it to the philosophy and science of our time. 'This revelation, which is known as it is received, and this experience, which is the experience of the revealed, have to be expressed in the thought-forms of our age.' In endeavouring to do this it is natural to inquire what reliance may be placed on Scripture and Church dogmas. In regard to the former we find that 'God has not willed to give to men a book of indubitable facts and clearly formulated teachings. A religion based upon an infallible handbook of religion and ethics would be a religion, static and legalistic. Christianity is not founded on a book, but on the personal revelation of the living God.' The Bible is the classic record of this revelation of God known in human experience and expressed in the thought-forms of its age. It is to be received as the Word of God in the sense that it is the only record of the redeeming love of God, a record known to be true by the witness of His Spirit in the believing heart.

With regard to dogmas, we find that the Church of apostolic times had no authoritative theology.

'What it had was a *kerugma*, a preaching message which represented the common tradition of the Church, and was summed up in such short and pregnant sayings as these: "Jesus is Lord," "Christ died for our sins and rose again." . . . Only when Christianity became the nominal religion of the Empire was the attempt made to secure the authoritative definition of Christian truth by Œcumenical Councils.' These dogmas did useful service in their day, and they mark decisive stages in the clarification of men's conceptions of God's revelation in Christ. But there can be no infallible dogmas. Each age has to formulate its own theology. 'We have the same right and obligation to express our faith in the thought-forms of our age and place as those who expressed Christianity in the thought-forms of the Græco-oriental world.' The one thing that is permanent and vital is the *kerugma*, the preaching message, for the Church cannot live unless it has a gospel to proclaim. 'Dogmas have their value as the expression of the way in which, in the past, errors have been rejected, and the content of the Gospel reasserted. But not even the most venerable and prized of the creeds can save us from the trouble of expressing our own faith. Theology has still to attempt the task of stating in the thought-forms of our age the common Christian experience of the God revealed in Christ.'

In a very able book, *The Head of the Corner*, by Dr. Louis Matthews SWEET, Professor of Theology in Chicago (Scribners; 7s. 6d. net), which is a first-hand investigation of how Jesus passed from being the Founder to being the Substance of the Christian religion, there is an interesting chapter on 'The Distinction between Fact and Interpretation and the Application of it in the New Testament' which not only reveals the quality of the book but throws some light on the value of New Testament ideas and beliefs. We hope our brief account of this discussion will send many readers to the book itself. It is an exceedingly helpful book for faith and understanding.

A broad line of distinction runs clear through the

New Testament books between statements of fact and statements of judgment or opinion. Two examples of this may suffice. One is in the twentieth chapter of John, where the writer says that the 'signs' which Jesus performed were very numerous, and that those he had related were mentioned 'that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.' The other instance is from the preface to St. Luke's Gospel. He says that many narratives of 'the established facts of our religion' have been drawn up, and that he has reduced them all to an orderly story, 'in order that your excellency may know the solid truth of what you have been taught.' The 'solid truth' referred to was the gospel which the Apostles proclaimed.

What is the distinction between fact and interpretation, and how does it work out? If you read St. Peter's speech in Ac 10³⁶⁻⁴³ you will find there in essence the whole story of Christianity. There is an *outline* of the gospel story made into the *substance* of the Christian message. And you can see how the interpretation which makes that message arose out of the events of history. The facts make the interpretation. Take, for example, the Resurrection of Christ which Peter centralizes. The fact of resurrection is not in itself momentous. It might be merely a portent. It became a part of the living message of the gospel because into it was poured the richness of the life and personality of Jesus. It is not merely a miracle. It is the truth of 'the Risen Christ.'

Or, again, take the assertion that Jesus was the Messiah. In the New Testament the term 'Christ' has a history. It was at first an adjective, then a title, and finally a proper name. In the Gospels the personal name Jesus is always distinguished from the title 'the Christ,' and the whole significance of the story is based on that distinction. In the later teaching this distinction has passed away, and Christ is just as much a proper name as Jesus, because Jesus for the believer *is* the Christ. But the value of the name for a gospel depends on the meaning which it has acquired from Jesus Himself. The Old Testament hopes and ideas give no basis for the meaning which actually filled the name for the Christian. The name was susceptible to mis-

interpretation, and in fact the Jews so misconceived it. The name had to be interpreted in the light of what Jesus was and did before it could fit Him. The Jew could easily imagine Messiah saying, 'Bow down before the Lord's Anointed.' He could not imagine the Messiah saying, 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.'

Or take the name Son of God. There is extant in Asia Minor an inscription in which Julius Cæsar is called 'Son of God.' A term which could be applied to Cæsar would have to be redeemed before it could be applied by Christians to their Master. The meaning of the title depends on what is meant by God. And what God is Jesus revealed. The greatest sentence in the New Testament is 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' It does not matter who wrote this or when it was written. It expresses what the Christians of every age have found in Jesus. And when they called Jesus 'Son of God' they put into that name all that He had revealed of God to them. Their God is the Father whom Jesus has disclosed. Again, the fact determines the interpretation. The moral and spiritual qualities of Jesus give positive content and meaning to the terms which are used to interpret Him.

Apply this principle to the miracles in the Gospels. Are these facts or interpretations? The vital matter is the relationship of these deeds to the portrait of Jesus. Are they congruous with His character as Helper and Saviour of men? There are two principles established at the Temptation which were carried out consistently to their fulfilment in His death: (1) the acceptance of the limits imposed by a genuine incarnation, a life of subordination, trust, and obedience; and (2) a Messianic career of love and self-sacrifice rather than spectacular self-assertion and conquest. Now the wonders attributed to Jesus embody and realize these principles. They are a congenial and harmonious element in His self-manifestation as Son and Saviour. They exhibit His character in action, and cease therefore to be wonders to be doubted. They are natural in Jesus in the highest sense. Could anybody possibly thus dream out acts of

Jesus which would harmonize with His character and uncover His heart?

As a matter of fact this applies to the whole portrait of Jesus. To construct an imaginary picture that would be true and harmonious is one of the most difficult feats of literary art. Indeed, it is hard enough to do this when facts are at your disposal. To do it 'out of your head' is an impossibility except for supreme creative genius. The life of Jesus in the Gospels consists of a miscellany of incidents in which Jesus speaks and acts in response to contacts with all sorts and conditions of men, loosely strung together, and representing the way the Apostles used to tell the story to pupils and listeners. And the only internal connexion between them is the character of Jesus. And the personality lives! We know Jesus! All the more that many of the details do not readily fit in with the ideas of the writers. They are telling the human story of the Son of God. And the human limitations are there simply because the writers cannot get away from the facts.

Notice this amazing result. The direct impression of the personality of Jesus upon the minds of the disciples was powerful enough to transform the very categories which were used to interpret Him. That is to say, Jesus has given to the terms used to describe Him, some of them consecrated by long and very sacred association, a meaning not drawn from history or common usage but from His own ideas and purposes. The preconceptions of His disciples were overborne and reconstructed by His personal influence. They were forced on all sides to a new scheme of interpretation. Take His teaching, for instance. That He should be a teacher at all was disturbing to the first followers. Messiah was to be something very different. It was only slowly that they came to see and interpret the teaching as wholly germane to the person. 'The light from his face fell on the teaching and was reflected back to the face again, lighting and giving light.' Here as elsewhere the fact was necessary before the interpretation became possible.

In the same way His disregard of many of the

most sacred things and usages, as they had been taught to regard them, must have been very unwelcome and puzzling to His disciples until they realized that this was part of His revelation of God to them. The sons of the Kingdom were *free*, and this was the point at which St. Paul takes up the very thought of Jesus. 'The sons are free' might sum up all Paul's teaching. And so we might pursue the same process in other directions. We see how the idea of 'salvation' was transformed by what

Jesus was and did, and how the apocalyptic hopes of that day were transfigured by Jesus and found a necessary place in the message He gave to His disciples. And all through the New Testament we see how the positive content of their conception of Jesus as Saviour and Lord came not from abstract considerations, or inherited hopes or longings, or from Old Testament promises, but from Jesus Himself—what He was and said and did and suffered and achieved.

Moral Problems of To-day.

XII.

Sunday Observance.

BY THE RIGHT REVEREND A. A. DAVID, D.D., BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.

THERE are three currents of thought which intermingle and sometimes conflict in the general approach to this question. The first comes from the Christian Churches, the natural guardians of the Christian Sunday; the second from the State, whose main function in this regard is to preserve the liberty of the individual, but to prevent his encroachment upon the liberty of others; and the third is public opinion, that unstable but powerful and, in the last resort, decisive influence in the ordering of social life. It is the purpose of this article to examine the interaction of these three interests, both in history and at the present time, and to suggest how they may be harmonized in the work of building up a just and wholesome tradition which shall allow for them all.

BEGINNINGS.—During the earlier part of the first three centuries, when most professing Christians were in humble walks of life, the question hardly arose. A simple service early in the morning with a common meal in the evening was enough to mark 'the fixed day' in every week for those who were not strong enough to separate it in any other way from other days. Gradually, as the Christians rose in social status and influence, was made the claim that their day of common worship should also be a holiday. This claim was strengthened by the tradition of the pagan festivals on the one hand, and on the other by the Jewish inheritance of the Sabbath. But it came from below. Public opinion

was steadily moving in that direction, at first without much guidance, or indeed encouragement, from the official authorities of the Church. By the end of the third century, however, the ecclesiastical and theological leaders were adopting, justifying, and administering the popular conception of a day like the Sabbath, set aside for religious observance and involving a general cessation of labour. In 305 a Spanish Council went so far as to make attendance at worship compulsory, and to punish continued absence with excommunication; and in 321 came Constantine's famous decree, enacting a public holiday once in every week on the 'day of the Sun,' with exemption for those who tilled the land. What his motive was, has been disputed. Probably, like most motives, it was mixed. It is likely enough that for social reasons he seized the opportunity to substitute a weekly day of rest for the numerous but irregular pagan festival days. But it is certain that he was largely influenced by the Christian demand for freedom to exercise their own observance. Thus he secured what every statesman seeks, namely, separate streams of support from different sections, converging, each for reasons of its own, upon the measure he proposes. The decree was generally accepted as the basis of particular laws of Church and State, reflecting the special emphasis laid at various times and in various regions upon particular directions of its application. One Council in 585 goes further

than Constantine and forbids all work on the land. On the other hand, a letter of Gregory the Great about the same time shows the need of restraint upon excessive Sabbatarianism. He protests against the prohibition of Sunday baths.

In the early history of Sunday observance as a social institution we may discern two facts which constantly reappear in its later developments; first, that it sprang from the rank and file of the public, and was shaped and re-shaped by their necessities and desires; secondly, that the Church, while insisting with Divine authority on the duty of public worship, was content on the one hand to adjust and adapt times and seasons to the habits of the people as crystallized in law, and on the other, to curb extravagant restrictions of social liberty in the supposed interest of religion.

THE REFORMATION.—The early reformers clearly understood the effect of our Lord's teaching upon the Christian interpretation of the Fourth Commandment, and firmly asserted it. But the trend of an uncritical allegiance to the letter of the Old Testament was too strong for them, and was pressed to its logical conclusion in a book written by one Nicholas Bownd in 1595, called *The True Doctrine of the Sabbath*. He boldly transfers to the Christian Sunday the whole observance of the Jewish Sabbath, and demands that it shall be enforced by law. This view was developed in a hundred and twenty books published in the next hundred years, and was strengthened both by the memory of excesses in the previous century, and by the licence of the Restoration. But the swing of the pendulum gradually sank to a narrower arc. Extreme opinions on either side were discounted, and the Sunday Observance Act of 1625, revised in 1677, represents a compromise which was recognized until late in the nineteenth century.

THE GREAT WAR.—In the meantime there have emerged two new conditions of life which have an important bearing on this question. The first is the fact that the industrial revolution involved for working folk harder and more continuous labour. And the second is the rapid development of transport, bringing new means and creating new habits of recreation. The natural result of harder work was a demand for a fixed day of rest. Even in countries where secularist interest was strong a weekly holiday for working men was imposed by law, and at the end of the nineteenth century Sunday had been almost everywhere set free from enforced labour. This negative observance survived even the necessities of war-time. In the first year of the Great War an attempt was made to abandon

it, with a significant result well described by the late Canon Glazebrook in *Hastings' Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (xii. 109):

'Intent upon claiming what they considered their right to recreation and convenience, the mass of the people did not see what was involved in its satisfaction. Shops were increasing, opened, trains ran in ever-increasing numbers, and a large number of subsidiary industries were obliged to join the movement. Then contractors who were in a hurry took to Sunday work; and there was a real danger that the industrial population might lose their day of rest. About the beginning of the twentieth century the trade unions and other bodies began to realize the danger; shop-assistants began to protest; and so a check was imposed upon the movement. In the first year (1914-15) of the Great War it seemed as if the national necessity might obliterate Sunday rest. Munition factories and many others were opened on Sunday, and double pay was offered for work on that day. But the result was uniformly a diminished output. Many of those who worked on Sunday for double pay spent the extra money in drink on Monday and Tuesday; and such as conscientiously toiled all seven days did so with rapidly failing energy. After two years Sunday work was generally abandoned; and it may be hoped that the nation has taken the lesson to heart.'

THE PRESENT DAY—STATE ACTION.—The share in the ordering of Sunday that belongs to the State is discredited on two accounts. First, because there cling to it memories of days when those who urged Sunday observance on its religious side expected the State to share their reasons for urging it, and to enforce it by law. They were slow to learn that it is neither reasonable nor possible to compel the expression of religion. Apart from the wrong principle involved in such attempts we know that they have all failed. Nevertheless, there still persists a half-conscious expectation that Church-going can be promoted by legislation, and the suspicion that this design lies behind much of the modern agitation for a better observance of the Lord's Day, calls forth a certain resentment from those who have no religious interest in it. This is one of the reasons why Governments have been unwilling to promote legislation on a subject which they are apt to regard as dangerous. Thus they have been content to leave old laws upon the Statute Book long after they have failed, till they

have become ludicrously obsolete. This, too, has prejudiced the whole question of State action in this matter. The time is ripe to think out again the principles on which the State should interpret public opinion and Church convictions side by side, and should determine how far either or both ought to be reflected in legislation.

To begin with, it should be recognized that there is a clear distinction between Sunday as an institution and Sunday as a day of religious obligation. As an institution it concerns every citizen of the State, and therefore the State itself. Freedom on that day from the compulsion and strain of week-day labour is now the acknowledged right of all. But experience has amply proved that this freedom cannot be preserved from encroachment except by the protection of law. It is, therefore, the duty of the State to secure the general liberty to rest and to re-create, and so far as it can to prevent the demand of some for any particular kind of rest or recreation from imposing labour upon others. This is a large and exceedingly complicated task, and we cannot wonder that Governments show no special readiness to face it. The Bill now before Parliament proposes to confer upon local authorities the power to allow or forbid some forms of provided and commercialized recreation, just as they can already refuse or permit Sunday games in public parks. As a matter of legislative policy the proposal has two attractions. By transferring its responsibility to the shoulders of local bodies, Parliament lightens a burden of its own which becomes heavier every year and threatens it with something like paralysis. More and more we look to Parliament to order the growing complexity of our industrial and social life. The result is an increasing multitude of Bills demanded. Only a small proportion can be pressed into the Statute Book, and of these not all are carefully thought out or wisely drafted. And when experience proves them wanting, the opportunity to amend them must often be delayed till they have already produced much harm and injustice. It may be that resort to local option is one of the remedies for legislative congestion at Westminster. There is another argument in its favour. In the long-run laws are respected and obeyed, or disregarded, according as they are recognized as imposing upon all the reasonable will of the majority. The smaller the area in which the popular will is asked to declare itself, the speedier and the surer will that declaration be, provided, of course, that the issue can be simply expressed. Cities have already decided for or against Sunday games. If they change their

minds, their decisions can quickly be reversed. It may be argued that in this way local option keeps a closer touch with public opinion than national legislation. On the other hand, nothing is more likely to confuse the principles of public regulation than an indiscriminate shelving of national responsibility. We need to think out what departments of government may safely be relegated to local control, and the question deserves more attention from political thinkers than it has yet received.

A CHRISTIAN SUNDAY.—The impact in this regard of the Churches on public opinion and in consequence upon the legislature, is weakened by obvious differences among Christians themselves. Large numbers of Church folk, mostly in the Evangelical tradition, hold firmly that Sunday should be marked by the complete cessation of all ordinary occupations, whether laborious or recreative. In their view to dig in the garden, to play golf or tennis, and even to listen to a band, is to desecrate the day. This implies that Sunday makes certain acts sinful which on other days are innocent. Others are unable so to read the mind of Christ. It seems to them that in this, as in other regards, He avoided precise instructions which would involve a list of things condemned; that in His judgment He considered first the motives and circumstances of acts and habits; and that He would make His followers free to decide in His Spirit for themselves and for each other. In so doing the first step is to bring our minds, cleared of all prejudice, to a fresh examination of our Lord's own words and example. When He dealt with the Pharisees on this question He revealed a principle fundamentally different from that on which their teaching was based. They enjoined Sabbath observance as a matter of man's obedience to God. The Sabbath was a test of that obedience, and the methods of rendering it had become so complicated and irksome as to overshadow all other aspects of that day. Jesus deliberately changed this basis. He taught that the Sabbath was a gift in which God showed His love and care for men. For man it was made, and by man it shall be ordered by the guidance of the perfect man whom God has sent to bring His Kingdom upon earth: 'the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath.' So is the Fourth Commandment, which our Lord never mentions, fulfilled in righteousness. It can never be abrogated. We should even hesitate to say that our Lord set it aside. But it is unquestionable that He separates in it the spirit from the letter. We are to obey the Divine command to keep our Lord's Day holy.

But we are set entirely free from the injunctions by which this holiness was impressed upon the Jews.

What, then, are the principles which should govern the ordering by Christians of their Sunday? The first is the obligation of worship. It is hardly worth while to discuss here the question whether this obligation can be discharged apart from gathering together for common prayer. There are and always will be some who find that their impulse towards God is met and satisfied in a field or a wood or before a wireless set better than in an ordered service shared with others. But our Lord's own practice and the age-long example of His Church show clearly that such an impulse, true as it may be, is imperfect, and needs to be developed. The response to God's love which is most acceptable to Him comes from men meeting with one accord in one place and bringing each his contribution to a common offering. Therefore the Sunday which the Christian orders for himself will provide time and opportunity for worship with others at fixed times.

Worship is rightly regarded as a duty towards God. But it has also a reflex effect upon ourselves. It is the highest and the most effective form of rest. In worship we ascend in heart and mind to the heavenly places. There we are surrounded by a silence in which the confused clamours of our daily work die down, and we attain essential peace. This is a truth of experience which is not confined to mystics and very pious people but is shared by ordinary faithful worshippers. Thus the Christian claim for worship, as for themselves the first requisite in the ordering of Sunday, goes to the heart of their conception of a day of rest.

It remains for them to select other occupations which shall minister to the refreshment and recreation of the whole self. It is their obvious Christian duty to society as well as to themselves to resist the present, and it may be hoped the passing, craze for speed and noise which has deplorably changed the whole character of the day. By painful experience the world must learn, and the Church must teach, that excitement and distraction are the enemies of rest. A man with a family and a home where quiet can be enjoyed will use Sunday as a day when family life can be realized and cultivated, always remembering that the particular form of quiet he needs does not always suit his children. May they play games on Sunday? Most would agree nowadays that no Christian principle is so transgressed. But from early years they should be trained in two convictions—first,

that their own Sunday recreation must never impose labour upon others; and secondly, that they should respect the conscientious scruples of their brethren, whether they are reasonable or needless and so far as possible avoid offending them.

Both these issues were once raised in a practical form at a public school, where enforced idleness made Sunday a day of special difficulty, which had been increased by irritating restrictions designed to prevent some of the dangers which lie in wait for a combination of freedom and inactivity. The result was a sullen boredom which was actually more dangerous than the perils from which it was (not always successfully) protected. The boys were taken into counsel and made some quite practicable suggestions. It was arranged that workshops, art and music rooms, and other opportunities of occupation should be open under supervision and with service supplied by the boys themselves. There was no demand for cricket or football. Of these they had enough in the week. But might they 'change' for the purpose of unorganized games on the ground that these 'would not be wrong'? Authority said no, and explained that so long as Christian public opinion in the town was against Sunday games in public recreation grounds, it was not fair that the School should enjoy what might offend. The reason was readily accepted.

THE CHURCHES AND THE NATION.—Besides determining their own observance of the day, members of the Christian Churches, have, as citizens, the further duty of exercising their influence so as to secure a reasonable regulation of Sunday which may apply to all. In so doing they may fairly claim some consideration for themselves. If a number of people, still large, regard themselves bound to set aside certain hours for a certain common purpose, it is reasonable that they should not be hindered in that purpose. 'Church hours' have always been in some measure protected. In one or two cities of the north where a considerable proportion of the people go to Sunday School at three o'clock, it has been urged that band music in parks should not be allowed to compete with traditional fixture. But in pressing these claims for themselves, Church folk should be careful to avoid the attempt to impose their own custom upon other people. Laws and regulations which seem to be based on the desire to drive people into church are bound to be resented, and have always failed. The Churches take the wisest and most Christian course when, having secured real freedom for themselves, they enter sympathetically into

the desire and need of 'them that are without' for the highest and healthiest relaxation possible in every section and class according to its circumstances. The full Christian observance of the day is outside the scope of law, and can only be promoted by teaching, and especially by example. The strongest influence we can exercise upon the public mind in this matter will come through our own faithfulness to the principles of our profession. When we argue that a day of rest is neither complete or secure unless it includes provision for worship, people will not believe us till they see that we ourselves order our habits accordingly. It may well be that both for our own sake and in the public

interest we need to rearrange the times of our services, our Sunday Schools, and Bible Classes. Social habits have changed and new necessities have arisen since the hours of eight, eleven, and six-thirty were fixed for summer and winter alike. The Archbishop of York has recently made some suggestions which will certainly be tried. Indeed, the time is ripe for free experiment in order to discover how in town and country we may adapt to man's varying conditions the day that was made for man. But in all such adaptation the witness from the Churches which will count for most is not denunciation of Sabbath-breakers, but our witness by example to the duty and value of public worship.

On Preaching the Cross.

BY PROFESSOR THE REVEREND A. J. GOSSIP, D.D., GLASGOW.

MR. COFFIN is a gallant spirit who holds his head up, and looks out on life with steady eyes. And yet he is uneasy. For the Churches, as they are to-day, seem to him to be little better than a shadow of what they are meant to be, with far less authority and thrill and power over men's minds and lives than they ought to possess—a thing sombre in itself, but much more disconcerting if, as he believes, one main cause of it is the sinister fact that too many of the ministry and of the people seem to have lost their grip of, and their interest in, the very core and centre of the faith; that Christ crucified is not being preached; that many so-called Christians are at ease on Calvary, and somewhat ostentatiously avert their eyes from that stark ugly Cross, partly because they do not understand it and can only hammer rather incoherently about it, and even more because, frankly, they do not like it, have an uncomfortable feeling that this grim horror will not fit into their cosinesses and soft ways, calls to hardihood from which their flabby souls recoil, and out on an adventure, which, while it reads well in the lives of others, is too heroic for their taste by far; and so they leave it out, and contrive to tone down the gospel to a drab and unexciting thing, which ordinary people can live out without such drain upon their gallantry or their self-sacrifice.

And thus, even apart from the buffoons who have come to the conclusion that the way to make folk

Christian is to say as little about Christ as with any shred of decency they can, and spend their time on flashy titles and ephemeral nothings that may catch vulgar eyes and fill their pews on any terms, many honourable men, resolute not to talk beyond their own experience, determined not to be unnatural or strained, keep to the sunny days in Galilee, and preach about the Master and the Teacher and the Healer and the Friend. But the Saviour! That they let alone. Loisy tells us that his father held his tongue about religion, because it had nothing to say to him. And many adopt the same simple policy about the Cross, and for the self-same reason.

Well! even so, they may have a real and vivifying message. For everything about Christ is worth preaching, can win and can transform. Not His death only, but His life, His character, His victory, His presence with us now, have their own glorious message and appeal. There have been great days in the Church, when the centre of men's preaching was not Calvary. In the sub-apostolic times the faith was spreading like a prairie fire, and folk were risking everything for Christ with a crazy gallantry. And yet their creed was curiously nebulous and superficial, seemed to miss the bigger things and the real source of power, with an odd blindness. Apparently the Cross was not the axis round which their life span. And in its glory the Greek Church of old, gathered about

the manger rather than on Calvary, was thrilled more by the incarnation than the passion of our Lord.

And yet it is not for nothing that the Church's symbol is the Cross. Quite certainly the Lord Himself was sure that it would give Him a queer irresistibility that nothing else could bring. Why did Christ choose to die? For He did choose. Why did He, while still young, elect to end those days of constant usefulness, to throw away the many years He might have filled with healing and teaching and uplifting, to turn into the path that led to Calvary, though sometimes His soul shrank from it, and on occasion He was less than certain where His duty lay, had to pause and think things out again, and feel for the hand of God to steady Him? Yet each time with deliberation He still set His face steadfastly towards Jerusalem and the inevitable ending there. Why? He Himself has given the answer. 'I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men to me.' I know men; know that they may listen to Me and be unimpressed, be healed and look for nothing further than their physical gain, meet Me and turn away. But if they see Me dying for them, then I win. And since He Himself deliberately chose that line of appeal, risked everything on that, surely it is treachery for those who speak for Him to huddle the Cross out of sight or at best into a very minor place, and less than a full Christianity such men declare.

And so Dr. Coffin, looking out over a Church quite desperately energetic, though often, as it seems, resultlessly enough, asks, Must not our work be largely futile till we get back to the proved seat and source of power? Cannot we manage to translate the Cross into our present-day thinking, so that with perfect honesty and with no sense of unreality or strain, men can preach it again with the old confidence and passion and abandon and, please God, with the old triumphs?

That surely is a practical and very central question; and he answers it in an arresting little book, *The Meaning of the Cross* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net), marked by his usual delicate aptness in quotation, subtle power of phrasing, and, above all, winsome sincerity.

One reason why the Cross is not being preached to-day as much as it used to be is that our sense of sin is dulled and deadened. The old theologies and the old preaching were built up on the assumption that sin is a terrific and a terrifying thing. And many folk were terrified by it. It shocked them to be smirched by it. Their alienation from God would not be forgotten. No doubt all, even of the saints, did not experience that with the same

acuteness. Thomas Chalmers, for example, more than once confesses to himself that he for one just did not feel the devastating horror that he found recorded in much religious autobiography. Yet, more or less, that was a prevalent mood. And now very largely it is gone. Men have convinced themselves that after all sin, or at least their sin, is no such mighty matter; very unfortunate, and not to be repeated, certainly; but there is no need to be flustered or to fuss. And they are not fussing. To folk desperate to be saved it was easy to preach Calvary. But can we preach it now? Must there not be a period of law work, as they used to say, before the meaning and the need of it come home to men's souls? No, says Dr. Coffin. Just because our sense of sin is dimmed, bring men to the Cross. For one effective way to use it is to set it there before us, and let it bring home to us its unique revelation of the awesome possibilities and facts that lie hidden away in entirely respectable lives.

For who was it that killed Jesus Christ? Not monsters whose presence among our kindly humanity we cannot explain, but very ordinary people like ourselves with very ordinary failings—some of the most zealous Church people of their day, but whose minds happened to be stiffly orthodox, and thirled to the familiar, and inhospitable to new truth, and irritably impatient of change and progress. And these very minor-looking sins of theirs ended in that, and in us also they are working havoc to the cause of righteousness to-day! And others, whose vested interests Christ had attacked, and who resented this assault upon their proprietary rights. And how many social sores have their root in a like selfish blindness? And one who had lost faith in spiritual methods, who had come to think that matters could come to a head more quickly and successfully along other and more material lines. And is not even the Church to-day full of those who seem more eager about men's social betterment than the salvation of their souls, who pin their faith to what Raleigh called 'the idiotic simplicity of the revolutionary idea,' to some quick-change external transmutation, we ourselves remaining what we are? And, not least, the people who had not interest enough to be there when the decisive vote was given, who assumed Jesus would be all right, who had other things filling their mind, and could not be bothered worrying about this matter one way or the other. And so the vote went for Barabbas, and Jesus was left unsupported and alone. And is it not just that crass mass of stolid

indifference and inertia that arrests and hinders the coming of the kingdom to this day and hour? So almost endlessly. Preach the Cross with some vividness, and some small understanding of the circumstances out of which it came, and it must bring a staggering revelation of the guilt that lies upon our souls.

No doubt our stark individualism may even then blind our eyes to it in part, our foolish notion that we are solitary units, our failure to realize that we are all involved in the sins of our community and nation. Hutton tells us of Maurice that he felt 'a self-reproachful complicity in every sinful tendency of his age.' And there was that feeling in Jesus Christ. Hence, argues Dr. Coffin, the baptism, in which vicariously He entered into the sins of the community. 'The Lord's Prayer is recorded as taught by Jesus to His disciples: it sounds as though He had prayed it with them. He who underwent the baptism of repentance may well have joined in praying "forgive us our debts." He was implicated in the sins of society.' Clean Himself, He was one of a community who were not clean, and He felt, in part, responsible for it and soiled by it. So, get men upon Calvary, make them look at the Cross; and with horror they will see that there is blood upon their hands, that they have crucified the Lord afresh, that in their hearts there is what wrought out that.

Further, it is only through the preaching of the Cross that there comes to us a due revelation of what God is like and is. Jesus was rejected as a blasphemer because a thing like Him claimed oneness with God. And yet nowadays to those who have once stood on Calvary, with seeing eyes and any understanding in their souls, this at least is clear, that if there be a God at all He must be Christlike; that to be God is not merely to be high and lifted up above the sorrow and the travail of this desperate earth—out of it all—sitting smiling on a sunny mountain, as Maeterlinck pictured Him, regarding our worst failings with something of the amused complacency with which we watch mischievous puppies playing on a hearthrug, but cut to the heart by it, unable to keep out of it, willing and eager to make any sacrifice, and to go any length, if thereby He can help and heal and save, and till that be accomplished, spending Himself unrestingly like a shepherd until the strayed sheep be found, and hurt, like a father who cannot forget his wayward boy, nor be at peace till he is safely home. Philosophers may mock at that, and prate about the unruffled serenity of One who knowing the end from the

beginning dwells in the calm and coolness of eternity; and theologians may talk with heavy learning about His impassibility. But that won't preach. 'A God that could understand, that could suffer, that could sympathize, that had felt the extremity of human anguish, the agony of bereavement—this is the extraordinary conception of God-head to which we have at this stage risen.' So Sir Oliver Lodge. Was it not God Himself nailed to a Cross that stretched across the whole breadth of the heavens that St. Francis saw in his tremendous vision? And that has come to many a humbler soul on Calvary. Beneath the Cross, all other conceptions of the Divine have grown old-world, and pagan, and barbaric. Elsewhere men may catch a murmur coming from behind the veil, and dream and hope and wonder what God may be like; but there that veil is rent; and, looking in, they see God face to face, a God that suffers until He has saved. It must be so. For human nature has risen as high as Calvary, and it cannot out-top God. He, too, has gone the length of that. His whole life is like that, is that, till we be saved. Well do I remember seeing Denney's face light up as he declared with a strange passion moving his very soul, 'I do not envy the Romanists anything excepting this, that I would like to be able to hold up the crucifix in the pulpit, and cry, "God loves you—like that."' And nothing but the preaching of the Cross brings that home to the mass of men.

And many other vital truths grow really clear to us on Calvary for the first time, or else gain a new power. The infinite value of a man, for instance, of any man, of even the shabbiest and most impossible of us—a man for whom our Lord did that. Montefiore, arguing that very much in Christianity is to be found in Judaism, honestly concedes that this seeking and saving of the lost Christ introduced is something new and very glorious—yes, and His valuation of these lives of ours which bids us act on the assumption, as He acted, that the biggest thing that we can do with them is to throw them away for those who look unworthy of the sacrifice, and that that is not a foolish squandering of what might have been put to some high use, but itself the highest of all uses, and infinitely worth our while. It is the Cross that teaches that, and when the lesson has been thoroughly learned, the Kingdom will have come. And so on endlessly.

But take these matters we have touched upon. Yes, says the present-day mind, you tell us that on Calvary we see what God is like, but is the Cross only a picture and a metaphor, or did some-

thing happen there that made, and makes, a difference: and, if so, what? You talk about forgiveness, and we believe in that, perhaps too lightly and with too little wonder, for there is sad truth in Rainy's cry, 'that we are no longer astonished at it in our own minds.' Still we do accept Divine forgiveness as one of the fixed and eternal facts of life, can follow the daring prophet in his bold declaration of the forgetfulness of the omniscient. 'Your sins I will remember no more,' he heard Him saying. As if we began our confession, and God pulled us up, and said, 'Sins! But were there sins? I have forgotten about them!'—an amazing metaphor of the whole-heartedness of what God means by pardoning. We understand the father of the prodigal, and know that, times without number, God in very deed has dealt with us just so. That we believe, that we accept, that we can preach, and do. But this elaborate machinery of pardon set up upon Calvary seems out of touch with that, confuses and bewilders, does not help. It may be that in other days that may have been needed to convince men of God's true nature, and His attitude toward us. But that having been learned, the ladder by which other generations climbed to it is of no further use to us. Given the God of Jesus' teaching, why the Cross? What is the need of it? What did it do? What is its rationale?

For my part I agree with Dale: 'I remember, says one, going to him in great distress; I wanted to preach on "Christ died for our sins," and I thought if only I could show how through the death of Christ it was made possible for God to forgive sin, many might be led to believe. He replied, "Give up troubling, my friend, about *how* it was possible for God to forgive sin, go straight and tell them He *does* forgive sin, and tell them straight that Christ died for their sins. It is the fact the people want most to know, and not your theory, or mine, as to how it was, and is, possible."' That, I think, is sound.

Still, the mind cannot breathe in a vacuum, and it does keep asking, How? And thus the literature on the Atonement is a large and varied one, some of it helpful, some of it quite blasphemous, most of it not much handled nowadays. And yet, if one fails to appreciate a great literary classic, a wise man knows that the reason must be some fault in himself. And if the metaphors for what happened on Calvary that helped other generations are impatiently dismissed by us, the probability is that our minds are lop-sided, that we are overlooking some side and aspect of the truth that stared at them. At all events, Dr. Coffin is quite sure that

the old terms and phrases—substitution, vicarious sin-bearing, sacrifice—are not just obsolete jargon; queer and old-fashioned garments impossible for modern wear, but that they represent real facts that meet real needs, and must and can be easily translated into the mental accent of our time; and in an interesting chapter sets himself to do so. Was Christ our substitute? How did He bear our sin? In what sense was His death a sacrifice? and the like. How can we preach these things to-day with meaning and sincerity?

But what fires his heart the most is the Cross as the standard for our living and our character. And certainly in preaching it we must make this quite plain, that it becomes effective for us only if we adopt its spirit and catch its infection, and live out our lives in our small way according to that plan. 'As I, so you,' says Christ over and over, laying it down that what He was and did and suffered was not meant to stand out as a solitary and unique thing, except in degree; that we too who are His must live in that same gallant, daring, recklessly unselfish way. 'The Cross is our boundary line,' our author quotes from an old Christian writer, and we must not stop short of that, but march right up to it. And yet we are not even trying so to do. We have taken just enough of Christianity to make us immune from a real attack of it, have dwarfed it into a dull and tame affair, without the danger, the sacrifice, the gallantry, the adventure, the Cross, that there should be in it. 'No one knows,' says Dr. Jacks, 'exactly what ideal of life the Church stands for, unless it is that of a kindly and good-natured toleration of things as they are, with a mild desire that they may grow better in time, so far as that is compatible with the maintenance of existing vested interests.' A hard saying, and yet is it not too true? So the Church dwindles. And we shall never recapture men's hearts and passions and enthusiasms as we had them once, until our call to them is Christ's call to take up the Cross; until we shame this caricature of Christianity into the big thing it is meant to be by preaching Jesus crucified, confronting men and women with the Saviour dying for them, and asking from His Cross that they too throw in all they have and are, helping Him in His saving of the world. Nothing else will ever do it. 'Again and again,' says Tyrrell, 'I have been tempted to give up the struggle, but always the figure of that Strange Man hanging on the Cross sends me back to my task again.' And nothing else will send a listless Church and tepid souls back to the work which it and they are here to do.

Literature.

THE LITERARY REMAINS OF BARON FRIEDRICH VON HÜGEL.

THE late Baron Friedrich von Hügel has made by his writings a deep impression on the religious mind of England. 'Our greatest theologian,' says Dean Inge, 'and the ablest apologist for Christianity in our time.' But what attracts us to his books more than the scholarship and ability of the writer are the candour, the restraint, and the gentle charm of the man. Those who have learned to admire the writer and the man will turn with great interest to the volume of his literary remains edited by Mr. Edmund G. Gardner, F.B.A., under the title *The Reality of God and Religion and Agnosticism* (Dent; 15s. net). Though it is composed only of fragments of two unfinished books, it serves at many points to illustrate von Hügel's characteristic thought and at the same time to afford glimpses into the workings of his mind and heart. There are also some delightful autobiographical touches in the volume.

'The Reality of God' in the title represents the first of the projected books. It was intended as the Edinburgh Gifford Lectures for the sessions 1924-25 and 1925-26. A fuller title of the Lectures was: 'Concerning the Reality of Finites and the Reality of God: A Study of their Inter-relations and their Effects and Requirements within the Human Mind.' The general philosophical standpoint was to be that of 'critical Realism,' and the book was to deal with its subject from the sides of Epistemology, Ethics, and Institutional Religion. The only portions of the MS. which the editor felt justified in publishing are the Introduction, the greater part of a chapter on Intimations of the Reality of God and Nature in the Human Mind, and chapters on the Moral Apprehensions, Morality and Happiness, Moral Perfection, the Need of Body and Soul in Emotion, and the Need of Institutional Religion. The last-named chapter is not given in its entirety, and the rest of this first part of the volume is made up of excerpts from other chapters which reflect the author's personality.

In this part von Hügel shows his essential loyalty to the philosophy of Aquinas, while at the same time recognizing that since Kant and Darwin there has been an immense accession of precise application and detailed insight, both in regard to the inner and the outer world. He is particularly insistent on the principle of natural theology. 'What was the discovery of Neptune in its suc-

cessive stages other than a sallying forth of mind certain of being met by mind? And now we have, within but a few years, a practically unparalleled series of discoveries, one after the other, concerning this reign of mind: a Mind distinctly not our own, and yet a Mind sufficiently like our own for us to believe It present everywhere, and for us, in various degrees, to be able to work into and with Its laws.'

'Religion and Agnosticism' in the title stands for the other book left uncompleted. It was a study of Alfred Comyn Lyall. Although the work remains a fragment, the extant portions here published had been revised by the author himself, and represent him—as the editor justly says—at the height of his powers and mental activity. The fuller title of this part runs: 'Sir Alfred Comyn Lyall and his Attitude towards Religion: Recollections and Reflections concerning the Last Twelve Years of Lyall's Life.' The first section, as explained in the Introduction, has to do predominantly with the philosophy of religion, and with Agnosticism in particular. Here it is shown how in his pre-Indian days Lyall came under the powerful influence of David Hume. The second section is busy with the history of religion, treating as it does of Lyall's Indian affinities and positions and of his strong trend to Euhemerism. This section remains incomplete; and the third section, which was to deal with Lyall's post-Indian aspirations, gropings, and intuitions, was never written. It was these later and latest 'pressures and pushes' of his spirit that von Hügel had the privilege of observing; and he intended to give them, like the earlier, a broad setting in the philosophy and history of religion. Adopting Bagehot's classification of thinkers as gropers (like Kant and Butler) and seers (like Plato), he perceived in Lyall 'the pathetic figure of a most sensitive and thoughtful mind perhaps really unable, once his early imprisonment by Hume was achieved, to be usually anything but a groper, yet who never lost the keen need, hence the real sense, of vision, and who indeed, in rare moments of his soul's sabbath, saw and knew he saw.'

THE ETHICS OF PAUL.

Dr. Morton Scott Enslin's book on *The Ethics of Paul* (Harper; 12s. 6d. net) is a scholarly work on an important subject.

We shall begin by giving a brief statement of the

contents, and then point out some dubieties. There is much in it besides the ethics of St. Paul—an evaluation of Rabbinic Judaism, an elaborate exposition of Stoicism, a peep into the mystery religions, and a revelation of the bottomless sexual depravity of the Roman world in the first century. All this is brought forward to throw light by contrast on Paul's moral teaching. There is some patronizing of the Apostle as a theologian which sounds just a little superior and of which we easily tire, but there is much admiration for him as a moralist.

The constructive portion of the book deals with Paul's ethical principles, his standards of conduct, and his moral precepts. The moral precepts are arranged under four headings, namely, separation from defilement (sexual purity), steadfastness in the Christian life, service through love, and rejoicing in the Lord. We have excellent expositions of Paul's ethical terminology—only the author leaves out the Pastorals, and he has not yet made up his mind on the Acts of the Apostles. It may be that Paul's precepts could have been arranged under other headings; our own inclination would be to use a great many more than four, for moral precepts are as varied as moral situations, but we have no quarrel with the author on this score.

The earlier section on the standards of conduct deals with such topics as the will of God, what is pleasing to the Lord and edifying for the Christian fellowship, the imitation of Christ, Paul's own personal example, what is fitting, convenient, praiseworthy, and natural. Here he repeats much of what he said on Judaism and Stoicism with obvious advantage to the clarity of his exposition.

On Paul's ethical principles he lays stress on union or fellowship with Christ by faith. The author says much on these topics that is valuable and that gives his work importance and distinction.

It is just because we appreciate the worth of his work that we venture to make some observations on points that to us are dubious. There are careless expressions like 'All have become sons of Christ.' It is highly problematical if any New Testament writer would describe Christians as 'sons of Christ.' This may easily be a slip of the pen, but there are statements all through this volume that strike us as doubtful, of which we give without much comment the following as specimens. Paul is 'a man whose primary interest was morals not theology.' This we think is, as the writer interprets it, a vicious distinction, even if M. Arnold and Percy Gardner think otherwise; and when Dr. Enslin forgets it, the issue is happier than

when he remembers it. 'The conception of salvation is distinctly Greek, not Jewish,' and yet Dr. Anderson Scott has given us a whole volume on Paul with this caption 'salvation.' 'Jesus misunderstood the Pharisees and especially the Scribes, as they did Him.' We are acquainted with Montefiore's and Herford's attempt to whitewash the Pharisees, but in all probability Jesus' views will not be displaced by these attempts. 'The Christian becomes hagios by baptism'—which seems a confusion between the sign and the thing signified. 'For Paul the final authority was the light within.' This has the genuine mystical ring, but we doubt if it is Pauline, certainly not in our opinion in the historical sense of the phrase 'the light within.' 'As a condition of discipleship Jesus had demanded the complete surrender of wealth'—an excellent example of a false universal.

In reading this book we feel ourselves pulled up frequently by such unguarded statements which mar its persuasiveness. But more serious than all these is the lack of a chapter on the Dynamic of Morality. The ethical problem to Paul is not one of programmes or precepts or even principles, but of power. How can a sinful, self-centred, enslaved man become holy? Before we can speak even of 'union with Christ,' we want to know who this Christ is and what He has done.

Now in reading this book, we wonder what answer this writer would give to the question—What think ye of Christ?—for He makes all the difference between Christianity and Judaism or Stoicism. The relation between the historic Jesus and the Christ of faith, and between His work and our salvation is not made clear in this volume, and it is a grave defect. One would like some serious discussion on the relation between Paul and Jesus, not simply whether Paul knew some stray words of Jesus, but something deeper, the claims of Jesus and His redeeming deeds upon the faith and obedience of men. It is this defect that makes the writer apt to get into confusion as to Paul's relation to the Law, namely, that he does not clearly distinguish between law as a means of salvation—the Pharisaic position—and law as a standard of conduct, what Rabbi Duncan had in mind when he said, 'Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and keep the ten commandments.' And this also makes him continually confuse the well-known distinction which, if the Reformers were right, and we conceive they were, is not scholastic but vital—between justification and sanctification.

In short, we find the book strong on the historical, but weak on the theological and philosophical side,

and yet we conceive that the ethics of Paul can never be understood apart from his theology and his Christology.

The book is written without any reference to present conditions in a severely historical manner. This we consider necessary, but we crave for some light on our present way, for the Pauline ethic or the Christian ethic is not a matter solely of antiquarian interest. In spite of all this, we have read the book with much profit and interest. There is a slight misprint on p. 44, line 3.

KARL BARTH.

Quite a little library has begun to be produced in English dealing with the work of Karl Barth and his school, but nothing better in this line has appeared than *The Significance of Karl Barth*, by the Rev. John McConnachie, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). Dr. McConnachie has a perfect knowledge of German, and writes as a personal friend and enthusiastic disciple of Barth. He believes that 'the most interesting event in the post-war religious world has been the phenomenal suddenness with which the word of Karl Barth has captured the ear of Europe, and transformed within a few years the whole outlook of Continental theology.' He is convinced that 'the appearance of Karl Barth in the Protestant Church, at this solemn juncture in her history, can only mean that he has been chosen and sent of God to do a work for his generation.' But the trouble is that Barth has the cryptic style of the prophet, and stands much in need of an interpreter. This function Dr. McConnachie performs to admiration. In a plain, straightforward way he sets forth the leading principles of the Barthian theology. The reader may agree or disagree, but at least he is enabled to understand. This is excellent service and will do much to commend the teachings of Barth to the Christian mind of the English-speaking world. Barth is in revolt against the spirit of the age, its pride and self-sufficiency even in the presence of God. By this spirit even the Church has been carried away into a fever of human activities, trusting thereby to bring in the Kingdom of God. For Barth salvation is all of God. He sets in the front the offence of the Cross. 'When Christ preaches Christianity no man can endure to be a Christian. But when a chattering goat proclaims it, we are all Christians by millions.' In Barth we seem to find the heart-shaking theology of the Reformation risen in power from the dead. Here is the material for a great evangelical revival,

beginning as of old in the 'broken and the contrite heart.' Here is a trumpet call to the Church to stand upright on its feet, and utter its Divine message fearlessly, instead of cringing before the spirit of the age. Lovers of the gospel will find Dr. McConnachie's book an inspiration and a joy.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

During convalescence in 1927 Mr. E. S. Hoernle, I.C.S., began a study of the Fourth Gospel. Certain difficulties impressed him. It looked to him as though two writings distinct in style, spirit, and content had been blended. He has now published the fruits of his study in *The Record of the Loved Disciple, together with the Gospel of St. Philip: Being a Reconstruction of the Sources of the Fourth Gospel* (Blackwell; 8s. 6d. net).

The main thesis is indicated in the title. No great stress need be laid on the authorship of Philip; the important point is that we have the work of two Gospel-writers: one profoundly spiritual, interested in what Jesus was; the other interested in what Jesus did, and proving His Divinity by the mighty works which He wrought—a line in which John is not interested at all. By this hypothesis Mr. Hoernle can explain contradictions which are apparent in the Fourth Gospel as we have it; he can give, too, a plausible account of what troubles every student—the seeming mal-arrangement of the material.

According to Mr. Hoernle, it was the Elders of Ephesus who resolved that the work of John should be enlarged by incorporating the most of the narrative record of Philip; and to prove that such a procedure is not incredible, he reminds us of the Diatessaron of Tatian. For details of this new view we must refer students to the book. It is rather complicated to be convincing, at least at a first perusal. It turns out that we have to consider not simply John and Philip, but two distinct writings by John, and then the work of three successive compilers. The final result is that our present Fourth Gospel is even more of a mosaic than the Polychrome Pentateuch. We pay tribute to the laborious nature of Mr. Hoernle's investigations, and to the ingenuity of many of his suggestions. Of many doubts which his hypothesis raises in our mind we mention only one. Is it conceivable that the Elders of Ephesus should have allowed to stand the gross blunder of the second compiler who, by mistaking a sequel for a parallel column to be worked in, put the cleansing of the Temple at the beginning of the Ministry?

ENGLISH IDEALISM.

Emeritus-Professor John H. Muirhead, LL.D., continues to enrich our philosophical literature. His latest work—*The Platonic Tradition in Anglo-Saxon Philosophy: Studies in the History of Idealism in England and America*—constitutes a valuable addition to Messrs. Allen & Unwin's 'Library of Philosophy' (16s. net). We do not quite approve of 'Anglo-Saxon' in the title, but that is a very small matter. We have read this masterly volume with great pleasure and much profit. Dr. Muirhead corrects a widely prevalent misunderstanding as to the history of English philosophy, namely, that the characteristic type of it is Lockean Empiricism. That indeed was prominent for a time, but it appeared as the interrupter of a far older English tradition which started with Scotus Erigena and in Locke's own century had experienced a strong revival in Oxford and far more markedly in Cambridge.

Locke's 'new way of ideas' did not cause this line to be obliterated. Coleridge was no mere disciple of Kant's, and Ferrier owed little, if anything, to Hegel. English Idealism, in fact, is more native and independent of German influence than histories of philosophy have sometimes allowed.

Finally, the author traces the New England development as represented by such writers as W. T. Harris, Charles Pierce, and Royce.

THE MONADOLOGY OF LEIBNIZ.

We have compared the translation of *The Monadology of Leibniz* here presented by Professor H. Wildon Carr, D.Litt., LL.D. (Favil Press; 10s. net), with the version of the late Professor Latta of Glasgow, and there is nothing that would lead one to suppose that, viewed as a translation alone, this new version was necessary. The translation in both is practically the same, and Professor Latta's book includes other works of Leibniz which are not given here. Besides, Latta's Introduction is very full and elaborate, whereas the commentary here and the various appendices are sketchy. Why then publish this new translation in a form which the publishers' skill has made a pleasure to handle? The reason is that Dr. Carr wants to bring Leibniz's views up to date, and, dropping from them what is untenable, to supplement them by two modern conceptions that make Leibniz's contribution to philosophy valuable for the present day.

The two modern conceptions are that of creative evolution, along Bergsonian lines, and the Ein-

steinian principle of relativity in physics. Dr. Carr in his other works has used both these guiding principles, and here he modernizes through them means the Leibnizian philosophy.

Leibniz, as is well known, tried to harmonize the Democritian and Cartesian physics with philosophical idealism. He regarded the reality of physics as consisting of monads—single beings each in different stages of living. There is no dead thing—each is conscious appercipiently or percipiently or rationally, and each mirrors the universe. While it is a different universe to each, it is the same universe because God had, by a pre-established harmony, arranged it so for all the monads. Monads are eternal, and God is the Supreme Monad on which the harmony depends.

Now Dr. Carr gets rid of the theology and tries to show that the principle of relativity conserves the individuality of the monads, while that of creative evolution conserves the harmony. So the justification for this work is not that it throws any new light historically or philosophically on Leibniz, but because it serves as a peg on which Dr. Carr can hang his own philosophy, and this is quite ample justification. It appears to us at times as if Leibniz's speculations landed us in pantheism of the old type—the Universe being a great living organism—the Anima Mundi of Stoicism; at other times as if it were a pluralism of self-contained monads which, or who, had to be unified somehow into a Cosmos. There is constant oscillation between these two positions, and the balance is in the direction of the latter. The theologian looks on with interest, and he has a philosophy of his own which conserves the importance of the three great metaphysical entities—God, the soul, and the world. The problem which troubled Leibniz most of all—the problem of sin—is not specifically handled by Dr. Carr, perhaps it does not fall within the scope of the *Monadology* as it does within the *Theodicy*, and yet it is a very great problem, one which we suspect all others depend.

While we read with interest the too short chapters dealing with Leibniz's position as modernized by Dr. Carr, we are disappointed that he did not give a fuller handling of it than he has done here; but this deficiency can be amply remedied by a reading of the author's many volumes, where he elaborates his view and tries to harmonize the age-long difficulty of doing justice to the individual and the whole—the one and the many. That he has succeeded even to his own satisfaction is doubtful, but the attempt itself is worth while, and the philosophical student will find much to

interest him in this book so delightful to handle and so worthy, as far as its matter goes, of its beautiful form.

THE GENEVAN SERVICE BOOK.

We bespeak a cordial welcome for, and a widespread study of, *John Knox's Genevan Service Book, 1556*, by the Rev. W. D. Maxwell, B.D., Ph.D. (Oliver & Boyd; 12s. 6d. net). It is scholarly and erudite, and withal most readable. It fills a real place in Scottish liturgical history, for Knox's Genevan Service Book is the basis of the Book of Common Order which was authoritative in the reformed Scottish Church for the best part of a century.

Knox's Genevan service had its origins, which Dr. Maxwell clearly traces. It owed much to Calvin, and Calvin owed much to the past. It is made plain that Calvin neither accomplished nor intended in this department anything absolutely new. His public worship was the old Catholic Mass stripped of superstitious elements. In the Scottish worship fostered by Knox there was, therefore, not the sharp iconoclastic breach with the past that has often been taken for granted.

The history of the Genevan book is fully exhibited, then the actual texts are given both in English and Latin.

Very valuable are the Notes and Appendices which we commend to the attention of all who are interested in the history or the enrichment of Presbyterian worship. They will learn to avoid some mistakes as to the past, and perhaps to avoid some solecisms in their own liturgical practice. Nothing can be more grotesque than to see a minister with a laudable desire to be more 'catholic' making blunders which are a travesty of catholic usage, such as wearing a stole with a hood, or wearing it at all at a non-sacramental service. On such-like points this volume is sorely needed and should prove most valuable.

MARRIAGE.

Two small books on marriage are worthy of particular mention because of the ability and frankness with which they are written. One is *Christian Marriage and Modern Practice*, by Mr. A. G. Pite, M.A., M.C., with an introduction by Lady Davidson of Lambeth (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). It is a thoughtful and on the whole helpful discussion of the whole problem. Mr. Pite does not shirk its more intimate aspects, and his counsels

are sound and sensible. They are sometimes, however, apt to ask too much. He lays stress, for example, on the necessity of joint-decisions by husband and wife. But there is really no such thing as a joint-decision where there is any difference of opinion. One opinion or other has to prevail, and this is just where the rub so often occurs. In his chapter on 'Partnership,' again, does not Mr. Pite ask too much of the husband when he suggests that he ought to take his share of duties that are peculiarly feminine? These are delicate matters, however, and we may leave the reader to discuss them with Mr. Pite. No doubt these problems should be ventilated. They deal with matters that involve the happiness of nearly everybody. But the more one sees of married life the more clearly it boils down to this: if people are really Christian, *i.e.* if they are good-tempered and unselfish, they will get on together. If they are not Christian, they will not get on.

The other book is *Marriage, Freedom and Education*, by Dr. H. Crichton-Miller, the well-known psychologist (S.C.M.; 1s. net). The substance of the book was given as a lecture under the auspices of the British Social Hygiene Council at the Annual Conference of Educational Associations in January of this year. Dr. Crichton-Miller discusses the subject from a different point of view. It is the social reactions of marriage he considers, and especially its relation to the modern demand for freedom. In all he writes he has the child in his mind as well as (or more than) the adult. The whole argument is conducted with a breadth of mind and a mental grasp that are very convincing. Monogamy, illegitimacy, celibacy are all considered, and all in their relation to the freedom of the individual. Dr. Crichton-Miller is on the side of the angels, but he knows enough of human beings to avoid banal idealism and to deal with actualities. It is encouraging to find that the considered judgment of such an authority is that only real monogamy is in the end consistent with real freedom.

DR. GLOVER ON THE NEW TESTAMENT BACKGROUND.

It is not news to say that Dr. Glover is the most engaging of commentators on the period that circles round the beginnings of Christianity. The reason is not merely that his scholarship is rich and exact. It lies partly in his insight, partly in his historical imagination, but perhaps most of all in the little bits of information and reflection that leak out as he goes on. At any rate, we read every-

thing he writes with zest and satisfaction, and no one will fail to enjoy his latest work, *The World of the New Testament* (Cambridge University Press; 6s. net). It has all his characteristic qualities; and (though we have some mild criticisms) we can safely say that this is an enriching book, with precious gifts of knowledge, and especially of insight, for the student of the New Testament.

The thesis of the book may be put briefly. Dr. Glover thinks that it was a great world to which Christ came. He sets aside Juvenal, and Martial and the Mysteries (about which, he says, we know far less than confident writers assert), and looks at the best. The best in that world was very good indeed, and the real achievement of Christianity was that it won the best. That world produced great types of men, and we miss something of the victory of Christ if we fail to realize the grandeur of the types which He captured. And so we have chapters on the Greek, on Alexander, on the Roman, on the Jew, on the Empire, on the Hellenistic Town, and finally on the Man of the Empire. It does not need to be said that on such subjects Dr. Glover is a master, and that his chapters are full of instruction and suggestion.

We have, however, a little grumble to make—or two. One is of a general kind. The sketch of the background tends to carry us out of touch with the New Testament. It is true that Dr. Glover says his purpose is 'not so much to outline a system as to give some feeling for what the Empire meant.' But the reader will, sometimes in the midst of his enjoyment, wonder how he is to connect it with the New Testament. The other criticism is about the chapter on the Jew. It is perhaps not too much to say that this discussion is less worthy of Dr. Glover than anything of his we have read. It is slight and inadequate, and might well be expanded in a future edition.

Nature's Witness to the Trinity, by the Rev. W. H. Hornby Steer, M.A., T.D., J.P. (Stock; 3s. 6d. net), is a quaint and interesting little book. Truth stands on a basis as broad as Nature, the writer thinks, and, since God is Three, there must be the stamp of this in the world He made. And there is. There are three 'kingdoms'—animal, vegetable, and mineral; three basic colours; three leaves in the shamrock; three kinds of water—seas, lakes, and rivers; three kinds of wind—breeze, gale, and hurricane; and so on. There is a sacred number

everywhere, and it is as prominent in other religions as in Christianity. Everywhere the Trinity is reflected from the world of men and things.

An earnest and helpful book on the psychological aspect of the Lord's Supper has been written by the Rev. D. S. Guy, B.D., Canon Emeritus of Ripon—*Personality and Holy Communion: A Fresh Approach to the Eucharist* (Mowbray; 5s. net). Experience is the real test of truth here as elsewhere, and experience grasps the Reality of Christ in many ways, which are here described fully. The reality in the Sacrament is the Person of Christ, and this is the same for all believers, whatever their theory of the experience may be. It is the same for the Roman Catholic, as for the Low Churchman. It is Christ that all receive. The discussion of these points in this book is carried on in a fine spirit, and with an admirable fulness of knowledge and breadth of sympathy. The book has a commendatory note by the Archbishop of York, and has behind it wide and varied reading both philosophical and religious.

The Theology of Karl Barth, by Professor J. Arundel Chapman, M.A., B.D. (Epworth Press; 2s. net), is a short introduction to the theology of crisis by one who confesses to 'being half a Barthian.' It is on the whole appreciative, though on some points critical or dubious. Professor Chapman twice repeats the current story of Barth having been a journalist. Barth himself has expressly said that he never was a journalist, and that the idea that journalism had 'left its mark upon his writing' is 'pure nonsense.' It is time that this misstatement should be dropped. Apart from this minor matter, Professor Chapman's little book is admirably fitted to introduce the Barthian school to English readers. The main positions of Barth's theology are briefly and accurately stated, the peculiarities of his terminology explained, and the value of his message to the age estimated.

In *The Divine in Man*, by the Rev. W. C. de Pauley, D.D. (Heffer; 3s. 6d. net), 'an attempt is made to show something of how the mystery of the Incarnation elucidates the two great mysteries with which man is confronted, God and himself.' The method pursued is to study the contributions to the subject made by Clement, Origen, Athanasius, and Augustine, and then to give a summing-up in terms of the thought of to-day. The work, if somewhat vague in its conclusions, is done in a careful and scholarly way, and the exposition of

the great fathers which occupies the bulk of the book is particularly fine.

Between September and December of last year twelve men of eminence in science, philosophy, and religion were invited to broadcast their views as to the degree in which 'the conclusions of modern science affect religious dogma and the fundamental tenets of Christian belief.' These talks have been revised by their authors and are now published under the title of *Science and Religion: A Symposium* (Gerald Howe; 4s. 6d. net). Taken together they make a most interesting and valuable contribution to what is one of the chief questions of the day. The tone of the whole discussion is marked, as we should expect, by great courtesy and restraint. Indeed, Dean Inge is disposed to think that both sides have been 'a little too polite.' Amid much diversity of opinion on various points there appears to be general agreement on two main positions. First, that science by itself is not enough. There are 'limitations in the kind of knowledge of Reality attainable along the line of the physical sciences.' Second, that there need be no quarrel between science and religion. 'The scientific spirit and the religious spirit have both their parts to play.' Both may bring us by different routes into touch with reality. Any one who, without going deeply into the matter, wishes to have some authoritative guidance as to the general lie of the land will find in this symposium just the sort of thing he wants.

Priest and Prophet (Kingsgate Press; 5s. net), by the Rev. A. J. Nixon, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., is a thesis approved by the University of London for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. 'Priest' in the title stands for the institutional and official aspect of Christianity, while 'prophet' symbolizes personal experience; and the whole is a study of the principle of authority in the Free Churches of Christendom, particularly the English Free Churches. Dr. Nixon's endeavour is to point the way towards a synthesis in religion of freedom and authority. He first examines the idea of authority, then shows the persistence of the true spiritual principle of authority in the history of the Church, and then seeks to apply it to the life of the Free Churches of to-day. As he says, the Catholic claim for 'continuity,' whether made by the Roman or the Anglican, may be allowed of the organization, but not always of the religion; and that is why 'the continuity of protest' has been justified. But at the Protestant Reformation the spiritual principle

of authority was not applied so thoroughly as it should be. The time is now ripe for a new Reformation to complete the work of the old, and the duty of the Free Churches is to be in the van of this enterprise. 'What is called by Troeltsch "the sect type of Christianity"' has often stood more clearly for essential Protestantism than the Lutheran or Calvinistic bodies, and it certainly represents it more faithfully to-day than the Established Church of England.'

Despite his good resolutions, Dr. Nixon's ecclesiastical sympathies are apt at times to run away with him. With wider reading he might have given us a better-balanced book. The whole truth does not lie with Fairbairn and Forsyth, Martineau, Oman and Selbie, even with Dean Inge thrown in. And although the book is written in a style that is clear, if sober and tending to repetition, it lacks the independence and the scholarly touch that one may justly look for in an academic thesis. A more frequent application of the good rule that quotations and references should be verified might have saved Dr. Nixon from referring to Schweitzer (*sic*) on page 103.

It is no surprise that Professor Josiah H. Penniman's *Book about the English Bible* (Milford; 8s. 6d. net), which was written some years ago, has passed into a second edition. The delightful comprehensiveness of the title has given the author his opportunity, of which he has not been slow to avail himself, of ranging over many fields of interest, but more conspicuously over two—the literary aspect of the Bible, and the history of the English Bible. These discussions are usually kept apart; it is all to the good that they are here brought together; for few readers interested in the former theme will be uninterested in the latter, and a minister might fruitfully sustain the attention of his Bible class over a whole winter by considering the Bible in both these aspects—What is the Bible as Literature? and How did the Bible which we hold in our hands come to be? Dr. Penniman's book is not, and does not profess to be, a substitute for an Introduction to the Bible: the Prophets, for example, are dismissed in less than twenty pages. What interests Dr. Penniman are its Imagery and Poetic Forms, to which he devotes two attractive chapters; and when a book takes its definite place as literature, as the Book of Job does, he is very much at home, expounding it, like a wise interpreter, profitably and at considerable length, in a manner more reminiscent of the Biblical 'Introductions,' which consider the content of a book as well as its form.

The story of the English Bible from Anglo-Saxon times down to our own day has been told before; but it is thoroughly well told here, and the special excellence of the modern versions in such matters as do not involve style is happily illustrated.

Men of Conviction, by the Rev. Henry Bradford Washburn, D.D. (Scribner's; 8s. 6d. net), is the Bohlen Lectures for 1931. These lectures deal with six notable figures in Church history. They are Athanasius, Benedict, Hildebrand, Francis of Assisi, Ignatius Loyola, and Pius IX.—'a rather strange sextette,' as Dr. Washburn himself calls them. Yet he amply justifies his choice. In an introductory chapter he makes a very interesting autobiographical statement of the principles which have governed his studies in history and led to his present choice. His practice has been to seek in the personal experience of men the secret of the movements in which they have played a leading part. Approaching them in this sympathetic spirit he has striven to see the problems they faced from their point of view, and to discover what there was in their work of permanent value. There is, of course, nothing new in this method, though, alas! it is so little honoured in practice. Dr. Washburn's historical studies, however, are an admirable exemplification of it, being vivid in delineation, penetrating in insight, and sympathetic in judgment. It is a book that makes the past live, and gathers the fruits of its experience for the guidance of to-day.

A Little Road-Book for Mystics, by Ælfrida Tillyard (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), was first published in

1922, and is now reissued after revision by the author. It is charmingly written and is manifestly the work of one who is an expert in the spiritual life. The various stages in the religious progress of the soul are traced out and illustrated by quotations from the great mystics. The general contour of the way is strongly reminiscent of Bunyan's 'Pilgrim's Progress.' Not every one will find here a record of his experiences and of God's way with him, but no thoughtful reader can fail to find in this little book a wealth of spiritual guidance and a rare blending of religious fervour with sound common sense.

The Very Rev. Michael Constantinides, Dean of the Greek Church of St. Sophia, London, has written *The Greek Orthodox Church* (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net) to explain the main positions of that Communion to Anglicans as well as to Orthodox resident in this country. He starts with the Ecumenical Councils, and proceeds to give information as to the national churches which together constitute the Orthodox Church. As to the first section, nothing more is attempted than a refutation by historical facts of Papal claims. While as Protestants we agree in the main with the writer's views, we fear that here and there in his argument a Romanist would not find it very difficult to give an answer. The next section imparts a good deal of information not easily accessible. A closing section gives a fair summary of 'Orthodox' faith. The book is on too small a scale for its programme; but as an introduction to larger works, and as a bird's-eye view of the field, it may serve a useful function.

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

XI. The Contribution of America to Systematic Theology and the Modern Situation.

BY PROFESSOR THE REVEREND DONALD MACKENZIE, D.D., WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, PITTSBURGH, PA., U.S.A.

Is it possible to diagnose the present condition of Systematic Theology in America (or for that matter, in any country) and to relate this genetically to the past; or can it only be described in Dr. Denney's phrase, as 'a cinematograph of chaos'?

Dr. Emil Brunner—*Theology of Crisis*, p. 2—speaks, and his words are specifically, though not exclusively, directed to America, of the 'decay of theological consciousness,' manifested in such slogans as—'Not doctrine but life, not dogma but

practice.' Is this true, and, if true, is it confined to theology?

Recently the philosophers of America,¹ following their British confrères, issued two volumes giving their individual positions, and it would not be uncharitable to describe their efforts, as far as consensus of opinion is concerned, as 'a cinematograph of chaos.' There is no similar work known to us by American theologians, and if there were, we can only guess what it would look like. Let us hope it would not be so chaotic as the work of our philosophical brethren. There seems, however, some justification for Dean Inge's charge against the age—that it is an age of irrationalism and misologism, and if so theology cannot flourish in such an age.

We certainly have little in the twentieth century to compare with the great systematic treatises of the 'seventies and 'eighties of last century which produced the works of Dr. Charles Hodge, the Calvinistic Aquinas; or of Dr. H. B. Smith, the August Dorner of America; or of Dr. W. G. T. Shedd with its stylistic distinction; or of Dr. A. H. Strong, though the last-mentioned work is, in our opinion, marred by a mass of amorphous details in small print. These were all produced in the beginning of the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and they are still used as text-books in many theological seminaries, in lieu of any better.

It is true that we have had excellent modern outlines of more recent dates, such as Newton Clarke's or Adams Brown's,² but they do not pretend to be comprehensive or thorough, and their mediating desire to smooth over difficulties is obvious; besides, they pass over in silence some of the common theological loci. We have also good treatments of specific problems,³ but they

are not organically related to theology as a whole, though indispensable as furnishing material for the future theologian.

Evidently something has happened to account for this. It may be the 'decay of theological consciousness,' as Brunner suggests, but we suspect it is due to theological dissipation. Knowledge in this realm has widened and deepened and has consequently become departmentalized. What was once done by one man has been parcelled out to specialists, who naturally magnify their own department and who often work independently of one another and are not concerned with the organic relation of their work to that synthetic view which is the very spirit of theology. It is, however, being increasingly felt that this analytic activity, fruitful and necessary as it is, is not and cannot be final. The theologian must conquer and control it and unify it into a whole. It is the consciousness of the difficulty of this that, partly at least, accounts for the dearth of systematic treatises in our modern age.

Perhaps the nearest modern approach to the work of the giant systematizers of last century is in the volumes of the late Dr. Benjamin B. Warfield of Princeton now being issued by the Oxford Press.⁴ He, because of his mental type and because of his hearty acceptance of Scripture as the only true *principium theologiae*, can be placed beside them, though he surpasses them as a New Testament critical scholar aware of modern currents of thought, yet of strict conservative orthodoxy. There would, I fancy, be little dispute—even among those who radically disagree with Dr. Warfield's presuppositions—that he has produced the most imposing *corpus theologicum* of this type in this age in America.

Why, again, this difference between the two centuries? Many reasons, each valid in its turn, could be given, but the chief one is that these systematizers had in Scripture an inspired matrix, and they conceived the function of theology to be to build up a system of doctrine out of this quarry by valid inference. Scripture for them bore the same relation to theology that Nature does to science.

They took seriously the opposing Roman Catholic *High Priesthood and Sacrifice* (1909); Dr. Sanday by his favourable reviews brought these to the notice of the British public.

⁴ Dr. Warfield's works appeared in *Princeton Review*, which Review we hope will soon appear again after its present obscurity. Four large volumes have already been issued and the rest are on the way.

¹ *Contemporary American Philosophy* (2 vols.).

² W. N. Clarke, *Outline of Christian Theology* (1898); *The Use of the Scriptures in Theology* (1906)—Christo-centric; W. Adams Brown, *Christian Theology in Outline* (1906); *The Essence of Christianity*—a critical-historical treatise of great value to the student, written from the Ritschlian point of view. Its earlier chapters lack the insight of the latter.

³ We refer to the many volumes on special subjects, as well as to articles in American Bible Dictionaries. [*A New Standard Bible Dict.* (1926); *International Standard Bible Dict.* (1929).] Of great value is the work of G. B. Stevens, *Pauline Theology* (1892); *Johannine Theology* (1894); *The Theology of the N.T.* (1899); Dr. A. C. Zenos, *The Plastic Age of the Gospel* (1927). A statement of N.T. Theology on an Aristotelian basis is W. Porcher Du Bose, *The Gospel in the Gospels* (1906); *The Gospel in St. Paul* (1907);

view of tradition, and Papal or *conciliar pronunciamientos* as an addendum to Scripture and confuted this claim, and also the views of the older rationalists, mystics, and experience-theologians and confuted this also, but they did not feel the force, as it is felt to-day, of the criticism of Scripture and the claims of other religions, and consequently could with a good conscience build their systems out of it. Nor did they hold, as so many do to-day, that Christianity was something to be constructed anew by each theologian out of his own experience, but considered it as a revelational datum, historically mediated, that had to be patiently understood and intellectually formulated.¹

While thus they differ among themselves on many points of detail and in philosophical grasp, yet they represent a common type, and they can easily be historically related to the general system of theology that, in the face of internal and external conflicts, has prevailed in America since the days of Jonathan Edwards, and even previously down to the closing years of the nineteenth century, and in some quarters still prevails.

The last named,² for philosophical breadth and speculative tendency, as well as for scripturalness and suggestiveness, may well be compared with Augustine, for there can be found in him germinally at least the sources of many streams that have since grown into great rivers. Emerson called him the first American transcendentalist, and others the father of religious psychology, and many more have fathered what they considered their own peculiar excellences on him. It is not our object here to determine in detail the contributions made by this thinker to theology, for this has been well done by many competent historians. Mention may be made of the excellent biography of Dr. A. V. G. Allen³ (1889) and of the *History of New England Theology*, by F. H. Foster (1907), both written from a liberal point of view; and on the other hand of *The Rise and Development of Liberal Theology in America*, by Winfield Burggraaff (1928),—a young Dutch-American scholar who writes from a strictly Calvinistic standpoint. He finds in Edwards the seeds of that dissolution of strict

Calvinism from which has sprung that hydra-headed monster, modern American Humanism.

There can be no doubt that Edwards (and his immediate followers) regarded himself as the champion of Calvinistic orthodoxy and the uprooter of deviations therefrom, but he felt the necessity of defending its more forbidding doctrines, and in so doing admitted the relative validity of certain current criticisms, or, if one cares to call them so, misconceptions of it. By his distinction between natural and moral ability—traceable to Amyraldus—he tried to maintain and reconcile man's responsibility and God's sovereignty in grace, and so to meet popular Arminianism which was, and still is, a strong current in America, and which, in fact, is the standpoint of the natural man everywhere. This raised a controversy on the nature of the will⁴ and its relation to grace which is of perpetual interest, and has cropped up in all ages of Christendom.

In America the controversy lasted long and branched off into many channels. The Oberlin School, for instance, emphasized freedom, and equally emphasized the need of the Holy Spirit. The inevitable logomachies that accompanied the discussion are partially responsible for the equation of theology in many American minds with scholastic pedantry.

Closely allied with this are the doctrines of predestination and the Divine decrees which, especially on the negative side (reprobation), were hotly resented and still are. The resentment has had effect even within strict credal orthodoxy, in the emphasizing of God's fatherly love. The orthodox Churches, for instance, have proclaimed God's love in regard to the heathen, and have embraced the position that all infants dying in infancy are saved, an article of faith which Dr. Charles Hodge defends from Scripture. Perhaps nothing in Jonathan Edwards has been more used by the enemies of Calvinism than his lurid passage on the future sufferings of infants. The discussion also has eliminated much of misconception from the doctrine of human inability or total depravity.

Edwards' doctrine of the direct enlightenment⁵ by the Spirit of God on the believing soul came near to mysticism, though no one was more

¹ The influence of science was grudgingly recognized—thus Dr. Hodge opposed evolution, while he accepted the geological account of the age of the globe, a curious historical water-mark in his work.

² *The Works of President Edwards*, 8 vols. (London, 1817); G. P. Fisher, *History of Doctrine* (1896).

³ Dr. Allen is best known from his excellent volume—*The Continuity of Christian Thought*, a book of rare merit.

⁴ It is a profound mistake to equate Edwards' Doctrine of the will with mechanistic necessity or fatalism. See W. Cunningham, *Reformers and Theology of the Reformation*.

⁵ 'Sermon on Inner Light' (*Works*, vol. viii.), 'On Religious Affections' (vol. iv.). Fenn, *Freedom and Truth*, p. 270.

emphatic than he was on the bankruptcy of natural reason and the need of a Divine revelation such as is contained in Scripture. Along with this went his strong emphasis on the superiority of the internal evidences for Christianity over the external which brings him close to Schleiermacher, though it is nothing more than the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum* of Calvin.

Of peculiar interest is his sympathy with the Grotian view of the Atonement, and in this region Macleod Campbell ascribes to him the germs of his own peculiar Penitence view which appealed to such diverse temperaments as Denney and Moberly.

But notwithstanding all this, Edwards represented orthodox and was not conscious of any departure therefrom. His interest was as much practical as speculative, and he possessed an indispensable qualification for the theologian, viz. deep religious experience. Mellowed, modified, chastened, and liberalized, this still represents the main current of theology in America, and no theology that radically departs from it can hope to commend itself to the Christian community.

Before Edwards' day there were, however, other movements which merit mention because of their subsequent influence on American theological thought. Of these we note first the mystic and individualistic tendencies associated with the names of Anne Hutchinson, Roger Williams, and the Quakers. While differing among themselves, they may be taken as a type of mysticism laying stress on the inner light, either natural or through regeneration, and making little of institutional or credal religion and of history.

In the case of Mrs. Hutchinson, we find a ranting and fanatical antinomianism, whereas in the case of Roger Williams,¹ there is sheer atomistic religious individualism. The influence of these groups was perhaps of more value politically—though even here not all wholesome—than theologically, for in the very nature of the case they abjured dogma and systematic thinking.

Quakerism at its best, however, gave a spirit of depth and inwardness and a breadth of charity to theology which it sorely needed, and which has now become the common possession of all schools, and in Whittier, Lowell, and others has permanently enriched the devotional and hymnal literature of the Church Catholic. This mysticism and individualism have persisted to our time and appeal

strongly to a certain strain in the American character in spite of its eminently practical and schematized nature. It is not peculiar to Christianity, but is a permanent element in human nature, and it appeared in America in a quasi-philosophical garb as Transcendentalism, scornful system of any kind, and to a large extent divorced from Christianity. It is naturalistic and rationalistic romanticism touched with emotion throwing a halo round Nature and the dignity of man, and finding its religion in a pantheistic deification of the Universe and of man—a kind of Neo-Stoicism more like the hymn of Cleanthes than the New Testament.² Emerson and his school may be taken as a type of this, and it is akin to the mysticism of Wordsworth without his reverence, with additions from Goethe and Matthew Arnold. A modern example is Ralph Waldo Trine, whose popular books, *In Tune with the Infinite* and *What all the World's a-seeking*, make a strong appeal to a certain type.

There is nothing specifically Christian in this mysticism—indeed, it is more akin to Neo-Platonism and Hinduism than it is to Christianity. Its direct influence on theology has been small, but it is difficult to estimate its indirect effect. One can easily find in it an anticipation of the attempt to get a common religion by extracting some essential identity from all the religions of the world such as characterizes the modern school of Religionsgeschichte Philosophie. Thus Emerson repudiates Christianity as a final revelation, and the following saying is often quoted: 'The religion which is to guide and fulfil the present and coming ages, whatever else it must be, must be intellectual. The scientific mind must have a faith which is science.' It is pantheistic, naturalistic, spiritualistic religion where personality tends to vanish and where the need for redemption is not felt.

The more Christian mysticism has an able representative to-day in Dr. Rufus M. Jones,³ who has done so much to repristinate Christian mystical heretics and give them a place in the real stream of Christian testimony. This type of nebulous, un-historical Christianity with all its claims to religious discovery is singularly vague, except when it borrows from Scripture. It easily associates itself with the views of Schleiermacher, which became known in America very early (Theodore Parker knew them well), earlier, I think, than in Britain.

² O. B. Frothingham, *Transcendentalism in New England* (1876).

³ Author of many volumes dealing with the history of Quakerism and Mysticism.

¹ Roger Williams represents in statutory American religion at Geneva. A cynic might say: 'An enemy hath done this.'

Orthodox writers like Drs. Hodge and H. B. Smith were very generous in their appraisal of him, though they differed fundamentally from his views.

Since the old idea of Scripture as an absolutely infallible and uniformly inspired authority was shaken, some theologians think they can find in experience either mystical or rational a source of theology sufficient for the present age and immune from historical criticism and dubiety. Thus the question as to the source and seat of religious knowledge and certainty—what the old theologians called the *principium theologiae*—was raised afresh, and this is still here as elsewhere, and here even more than elsewhere, a burning question (see W. A. Brown, *Pathways to Certainty*). Quaker theology, however, on the whole has been scriptural, and when it borrows from the written word its inner light shines with a flame that warms and enlightens theology. Its danger is in itself, its safety in Scripture. If it has anything to say more than the reformed view of the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit, it fails to make it clear.

As striking as the above is the strain of rationalism which is found in American thinking from the start. It is not our purpose here to discuss the historical origin of this. Some would find it in the influence of deistic and atheistic France, whose support of America in the Revolutionary War favourably disposed the youth of that time towards French thought and all things French. That this was a real source is evident from contemporary testimony.¹ Tom Paine's *Age of Reason* and the *Works of Benjamin Franklin* were widely read. Others would trace it to a reaction against rigid Calvinism, and particularly against the doctrines of total depravity, reprobation, and eternal torments.

We are not concerned here with the negative side of this movement which ultimately landed in Anti-Christian rationalism and atheism, represented in the past by Ingersoll and to-day by the Atheistic Society of America, and by a great many newspaper columnists like H. E. Barnes, but with its more religious side.

Channing represents this at its best. W. E. Channing (1780–1842) was not a systematic thinker, but he was an earnest, ethical preacher and writer of humanistic Arianism. He is best viewed, not

as the adversary of Trinitarianism, but as the opponent of the rigid doctrines of a high Calvinism as he understood them. He believed in special revelation as contained in Scripture, in the Biblical miracles, in the pre-existence of Christ and His resurrection; but the main stress was placed on reason, the dignity of man, and the paternal benevolence of God. Christ is our great Teacher whom we have to imitate. It is clear that his high view of Jesus Christ is metaphysically more mysterious from the point of view of reason than is the Christ of Nicea. His theology had much about it of the old system in which he was brought up, and is therefore satisfying neither to the old nor to the new.

With the advent of Theodore Parker, the tone, temper, and platform of Unitarianism changed. Parker was aggressive, scornful, and dogmatic, and Channing accuses him of making truth 'unnecessarily repulsive,' but though less religious, he was more logical than Channing and better informed. He introduced into American popular thought the then results of negative German criticism, and in his case there was no appeal to Scripture for proofs as in the case of Channing. He ultimately carried Unitarianism—in the face of protests from the older and more temperate, but less logical school of Channing—outside Christianity as ordinarily understood, and made it one phase among others of the universal religious consciousness. There was no longer any attempt to defend positions from Scripture, one of the sect saying in old age that he had discovered that the Bible was wonderfully orthodox. Parker speaks of the Bible at times with a venom that would do credit to Tom Paine, but he speaks of reason and conscience and the dignity of man with fervour. He is less interested in Christianity than in the religious consciousness, and less interested in religion than in ethics.²

Since Parker's time, Unitarianism has not prospered as a religion, and is now largely a social ethic with a veneer of theism.³ One of its chief representatives, J. Haynes Holmes, has deserted Christianity for Comtism reinforced by social science and psychology. Even the old insistence on Con-

¹ Timothy Dwight found Yale seething with what he called Infidel Philosophy; cf. *Two Centuries of Christian Activity at Yale*, edited by J. B. Reynolds (1901). See also *Memoirs of Channing*, vol. i. p. 60; Channing, *Works*, London (1880). See J. Martineau, *Essays and Addresses* (1901).

² Rudolph Otto on Parker. *The Idea of the Holy* (ch. vii.) says Parker did not know what sin was, and consequently was lacking in the purely religious element and so could not understand the Atonement, which can only be understood from within religion and not from within pure morality.

³ J. H. Allen, *The History of Unitarianism in the United States* (1894).

science which characterized Unitarianism is largely lost, and we may compare it in this respect with de-theologized Judaism which in America started the ethical movement¹ based on conscience without religion—prophetism without a soul, and which has practically passed away. Christian theology does not expect to learn much from this quarter, or modern Unitarianism has deliberately stepped outside of historic Christianity even in its most attenuated form, and seems to be stepping outside of high ethical theism.

Quite different in spirit and content is the movement known as the 'New Theology.' It found eloquent expression in a host of great and honourable preachers and writers, at whose head is Horace Bushnell² (1802-1876), and which includes such well-known names as Theodore Munger, George A. Gordon, Newman Smyth, and his brother Egbert, Lyman Abbott, Washington Gladden, David Swing, and many more.

Bushnell was keenly alive to the force of the Unitarian moral arguments against the prevailing orthodoxy and in hearty sympathy with the humanism of Channing, but he was convinced that orthodoxy purified held the saving truths and the redemptive power that men needed for salvation. With this conviction he set about stripping orthodoxy of its scholastic terminology and obsolete dogmas, and he conceived himself as thus exhibiting by his new method of presentation and approach to Christianity a living faith for a moribund age. He was in no sense a systematic thinker. His biographer (Munger) confesses that he wrote first and thought afterwards, as is manifest by a comparison of his works on the Atonement, and by his saying, after inveighing against the Nicæan Creed, that there was more in it than he thought. This noted instinct against system made him speak lightly of dogma and of the inadequacy of language which is symbolic. In his emphasis on paradox as the fitting vehicle of truth, he is in sympathy with modern Barthianism. He lays stress on the supernatural, and here he severely condemns Parker, who did not see that the supernatural or personal was the Crown of the natural, grace of Nature, and Christ of man. Christ is the Miracle—the Sinless Man (cf. Newton Clarke). His view of the Person of Christ was very exalted, and his whole attitude Christocentric. He construed God in terms of Christ, somewhat in a Sabellian fashion, and thus saved the way, particularly in his view of the Divine

suffering, for Patripassianism,³ which evidently has such a modern appeal.

But Bushnell's strong point was not dogmatic accuracy of expression, and so one writer accuses him of all the Christological heresies in turn—Apollinarian, Nestorian, Eutychian. He could not compete in argument or scholarship or exactness of language with the champions of orthodoxy, but his appeal was deeper, and he laid stress on ethical elements and religious sentiments that were apt to be submerged by them in the interests of systematic coherence. Bushnell is best known to the theological student for his view on the Atonement—often called the moral view—but which even in its earlier version is much deeper than the ordinary moral view, while in his later utterances on this topic even Charles Hodge could find little to object to.

One of his most fruitful books is that on Christian Nurture which may be regarded as the source of the imposing discipline known in America—and little understood in Britain—as religious education; but Bushnell is not to be blamed for the subsequent developments in this line which threaten to become a Christianized scribism and casuistry and is in danger of becoming a rival to prophetism and preaching.⁴ The influence of Bushnell is very great, and his successors served as mediators and conservers of true spiritual Christianity in an age deeply disturbed and distracted by naturalistic science and negative criticism.

The late Dr. A. B. Bruce of Glasgow early tried to acquaint the British public with the works of Newman Smyth,⁵ and was one of the first to appreciate the value of the work of this school. It may be said that outside rigid orthodoxy this represents Liberal Orthodoxy to this day (both in America and in Britain), and the difference between the two is not so great as they themselves often think. Dr. Buckham—*Progressive Religious Thought in America* (1919)—gives from the point of view of a too ardent admirer an excellent description of the

³ *Modern Patripassianism in America*: Bishop McConnell, 'Is God Limited?' See for a review of the whole subject, B. R. Brasnett, *The Suffering of the Impassible God*.

⁴ In many churches in America the Sunday School (for adults) is a serious rival to the worship of the Sanctuary. In Theological Seminaries Religious Education is a separate discipline; see 'Religious Education,' by T. G. Soares, in *Religious Thought in Last Century*, edited by G. B. Smith (1927).

⁵ Newman Smyth, well known for his book on *Christian Ethics*, and *Old Faiths in New Light*. His works (apologetic) are well worth reading.

¹ Felix Adler, *The Ethical Movement*.

² M. B. Cheney, *Life and Letters of Horace Bushnell* (1880); T. T. Munger, *Horace Bushnell*.

movement and of the chief exponents of it, while Burgraaff regards it from the orthodox point of view with criticism and too much suspicion.

It seems to us that Dr. Gordon¹ (born in Insh, Aberdeenshire, Scotland) is in many respects the most representative of this school, and so we give some of his most important works. For one thing, he may be regarded as the father of American Humanism in its more Christian aspect, and he is more speculative than the school in general.

Washington Gladden² and others laid stress on the social gospel, after the manner of Maurice and Kingsley in England, and anticipated the modern interest in sociological problems and in what is sometimes called applied Christianity. In its main features and temper it is similar to the Broad Church Movement in England, and has the charm as well as the weakness of that movement. It owes almost as much to Hellenism and Humanism of the Erasmian type, only that for Erasmus' *litterae humaniores* it substituted science—as to Biblical Christianity. It is more at home in dealing with the glories of human nature than it is in dealing with the mysteries of grace. If we strip Dean Inge of his cynical and pessimistic garb, his views fairly represent the spirit of the movement. It attempts to mediate between religion and science, reason and revelation, nature and grace, immanence and transcendence, Hellenism and Hebraism, Christianity and Platonism, and like all mediators is in danger of losing sight of the distinctive elements in Christianity and the radical difference between Christ and all other rivals. Especially does its weakness come to light in dealing with the problem of sin and with the righteousness of God. Its facile treatment of the former is deplored³ from within the movement itself, and its emphasis on the paternal benevolence of God tends to loosen the conception of the moral order and introduce into ethics a radical empiricism. Dr. John Duncan⁴ long ago pointed out this danger in dealing with Maurice. The consequence is that

¹ G. A. Gordon, *The Christ of To-Day* (1895); *Immortality and the New Theodicy* (1897); *Ultimate Conceptions of Faith* (1903); *Humanism in New England Theology* (1920).

² Washington Gladden's, Peabody's, and Rauschenbusch's works are well known. C. C. MacCown, *The Genesis of the Social Gospel* (1929), gives an elaborate treatment; and Shailer Mathews, here, as in other branches of theology, has done excellent service.

³ Cf. H. E. Fosdick, *Progressive Christianity*, pp. 169-179, and *American Journal of Theology*, vol. xvii. (1913).

⁴ *Colloquia Peripatetica*.

in dealing with the Atonement it lacks the spiritual depth of the older orthodoxy.

Theology in America has been always very sensitive to the prevailing currents of thought both at home and abroad. Dr. T. G. Wright⁵ has given a most interesting account of European influence in the century from 1620-1730, and this sensitive-ness still exists. Many of the Churches started on European soil and carried their theology with them. Lutheranism in America has kept close to Biblicism and Pietism, and has been not favourably affected by the extreme views of the Fatherland.

The philosophies of Locke, Berkeley,⁶ the Scottish School, Coleridge, have each given a colour to theological apologetic and natural theology, and in this department American thinking has been exceedingly fruitful.

Just as happened in Britain, the absolute idealism of Hegel was commandeered for a time into the service of Christianity and became a valuable *ancilla theologiae*. Later, in the hands of Josiah Royce⁷ and others, it showed the cloven hoof of elusive pantheism and sought patronizingly to explain Christianity as a vulgar form of Hegelianism. Royce regarded religion as loyalty to the beloved community rather than as personal faith in Jesus Christ. Often using the sacrosanct language of Christianity it lost sight of its values and spirit, and despised the claim of Christianity to be a final historic revelation. Assuming that God spoke everywhere, it gave the impression that He did not speak anything distinctive anywhere. Creation became a material theophany, and redemption the development of the Idea. The Christian emphasis on sin and God's will disappeared.

Perhaps the most interesting native development is the Pragmatism of William James and the Personalism of Borden P. Bowne.⁸ It may be possible to trace these to France on the one

⁵ *Literary Culture in Early New England* (1920).

⁶ For Berkeley and Jonathan Edwards see Campbell Fraser, *Berkeley*. The apologetic works of D. MacCosh, of Dr. Ladd, of Dr. Patten are based on the intuitionism of the Scottish School. Dr. Fisher's *Works on Natural Theology* are of great value.

⁷ Josiah Royce, *The Problem of Christianity* (1913); *The Sources of Religious Insight* (1912); *The Philosophy of Loyalty* (1908). Miss Calkins seems to indicate that in his last years, owing to the War, he became more personalistic. Miss Calkins herself is one of the foremost American Hegelians with a definite Christian outlook.

⁸ See *Life of Borden P. Bowne*, by Bishop McConnell A. C. Knudson, *Philosophy of Personalism*—an excellent survey and presentation; also *Present Tendencies in Religious Thought* (1924), and his recent volume on *God*.

hand, and to Herrmann Lotze on the other, but they are sufficiently characteristic of American thought to maintain for them a specifically national flavour. As a protest against the abstractions of Hegelianism these rendered needed service, and for a time American theologians and preachers were glad to use pragmatism for Christian apologetic and evangelistic purposes. Contending that Christianity 'Delivered the goods,' therefore it was true, they forgot the ominous fact that error and illusion have often worked very effectively in history, and will likely work for a long time to come. It cannot be said that the influence of Pragmatism on American religious thought was fortunate, for it is just a disguised form of Utilitarianism. It still survives in the Instrumentalism and Creativism of John Dewey, but it has largely lost the animation James gave it, and it has wholly lost its religious mystical flavour—a heritage from James' Swedenborgian ancestry.

There was much in it akin to one element (and not the best) in Ritschlianism. It is significant that Leuba¹ appeals to the latter in defence of his own view that all religion is a Feuerbachian Wünschwesen with nothing beyond or above to which it corresponds or of which it is the reflection. It refuses to face ultimate issues, and in this respect is less akin to theology than Hegelianism. The idea that philosophy can dispense with the arguments for God's existence or refuse to raise the question of God—or that by saying 'values' we can leave the metaphysical question alone—is an amiable intellectual weakness which cannot last.

On a far higher level is Personalism, and Dr. Bowne has rendered permanent service to the cause of philosophical theology both in person and by inspiring others to follow in his steps. The Boston Personalistic school is very productive and productive of good. It needs to free itself from coquetting with the idea of a finite developing God, to bring it into line with the main stream of great theological thinking. Two recent books² issuing from this school disagree on this fundamental question. It is difficult for one trained in the conception of God's sovereignty to understand how even a thinker like Dr. Garvie³ can play with this idea of finiteness. This is not the way to conserve the worth of man. We need a Christian philosophy

badly, and the bankruptcy of present philosophy is due largely to its departure from a theistic basis.

As in other countries, the emergence of the scientific view of the world has had great effect on American theology, and many have taken Emerson's dictum seriously that science must form the basis of any modern theology.⁴ The progressiveness of applied science and its mass-productiveness are perpetually contrasted with the stationariness of theology without considering the truth or applicability of the analogy. In the earlier period reconciliation was sought for by maintaining that evolution did not matter as it was a method of God's working, and many books were written with the caption 'Christianity and Evolution' (cf. Lyman Abbott, *The Theology of an Evolutionist*).⁵ To read these to-day is like reading the ephemeral books of the War period. Good was, however, done in the way of freeing theology of antiquated science and in reminding science of its incompetence outside its own bounds. Controversy arose between those who took Scripture as a scientific text-book and those who with gullibility swallowed the latest scientific theories as if they were a new revelation for theology, and a substitute for it. Much of the controversy between militant Fundamentalists and irresponsible Modernists was due to this confusion, and it is difficult to determine which side was the greater victim or victimizer. One thing seems clear, that scientific knowledge is not Christianity. Even interpreted religiously, scientific metaphysic can only give us mysticism or religious rationalism, and both these need christianizing.

Those who talk vaguely of scientific method in religion find it necessary to come to psychology and sociology and history—sciences dealing with man—and it is a matter of serious consideration if in such realms the methods of natural science are not already transcended.

An interesting attempt of a distinctly theological kind was the endeavour to bring God under the sway of evolution. Working with the biological views of Bergson and the historical relativism of Troeltsch, G. B. Foster and others⁶ (following

¹ This is the whole argument of Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes in his recent book—*The Twilight of Christianity*. Dr. Barnes is a philosophical agnostic and a sociological positivist. Agnosticism as a system has not had much vogue in America.

² Of books dealing with Science and Religion eirenically, the following are of value: N. Smyth, *Through Science to Faith* (1902); Shailer Mathews, *The Contributions of Science to Religion* (1924); J. M. and M. C. Coulter, *Where Evolution and Religion Meet* (1924).

³ G. B. Foster, *The Finality of the Christian Religion* (1906).

¹ J. H. Leuba, *A Psychological Study of Religion* (1912), and *The Psychology of Mysticism*.

² A. C. Knudson, *The Doctrine of God*; E. S. Brightman, *The Doctrine of God*.

³ *Theology*. These books are welcome signs of the growing interest in Christian Theology.

William James) adumbrated the thesis that God Himself was progressing by experimentation and that He had still a considerable way to go. H. G. Wells popularized this notion, and Dr. Alexander in *Space, Time, and Deity* philosophized it. It is based on the notion that God is the essence of psychology and sociology and the world-process distilled, and so it has great vogue in America in certain psychological and sociological and historical schools, and it works out into strange results. The anthropomorphism of Xenophanes is tame in comparison.¹

The influence of religious psychology which was cultivated early by pioneers like Starbuck, Coe, and James was at first confined to accumulation of data with some few inferences, but as time went on the metaphysical question arose, as it was bound to arise, and Dr. Leuba and others are now sure that religion is just the projection of the soul's contents on the void. Others, like Stanley Hall, find nothing objective in Jesus Christ, because all the ideas of Him and of God—even the most fantastic—are equally true psychologically and equally false metaphysically. To Ames, God is the spirit of the community idealized whose only reality is in our spirits. To others He is a supernatural complex—in all cases something which has being only in man's spirit.

Nothing is commoner in America than to hear it said that theology² must be based on experience, and yet nothing is less obvious, for there is experience and experience—and the attempt to determine God or Jesus Christ by a popular vote or an indiscriminate questionnaire (and that is what in practice this often means) seems self-condemned;—besides experience does not begin *in vacuo*; it is the commerce between Reality and Life, and in as far as it appropriates Reality it is of value,

¹ Stanley Hall, *Jesus Christ in the Light of Psychology* (1923), an enormous volume of 740 pp. He gives all the views, apocryphal and imaginative, about Christ, and, as some one thought them, they seem all equally on a par. It is the *reductio ad absurdum* of a non-critical psychology as applied to Christianity; E. S. Ames, *The New Orthodoxy, Religion*, and many other works. This is social Christianity without a personal God.

² D. C. Macintosh, *Theology as an Empirical Science*. Raymond Calkins, *The Eloquence of Christian Experience* (1927), an eloquent popular volume on the lines of Stearns and Dale, true to the facts of Christian revelation, and yet illogically attempting to deduce them from experience. How can you get the objective truth of Christ's Person—say, the Resurrection from our experience?

not otherwise. A way out is sought by appealing to universal religious experience, and thus great activity is manifested in studying all its historical phases with the intention of discovering a common denominator. So we have theology flattened out into a history of religions or a philosophy of religion or an interpretation of religious experience, pretending to start without assumptions or convictions but we are still by this method in the region of the phenomenal and the human and we are without criterion, for the dubieties of one individual are not removed by adding to them the dubieties of all, they are only aggravated.

This pose of scientific neutrality and indifferentism in Christian theology must be given up, for it never really existed. Assumptionless theologians and critics of theology bristle with assumptions. This was never the method of Christian theology. It started with the certainty of God.

It is singular how little attention has been paid in America to those modern theocentric movements in Europe that are calling us back to a saner way. Rudolph Otto has been singularly neglected, and Barthianism has only caused terror. But the fever heart of Christian theology in America has always been at home here. God is the Reality, and God's Word revelation. He has revealed Himself in the moral order and redemptively in history, and this revelation is in His Word, and He calls for acceptance and decision on man's part in response to this. The habit of putting prophets and evangelists and apostles in the witness-box of criticism on oath and indeed putting them under a microscope, has been overdone—it is largely finical historical scepticism based on a naturalistic and so a non-theological view of history. Theology is not what we say about God, but what He has spoken about us and to us, and to all mankind. Theology begins in unshakable convictions. Till we take up this personal attitude to God's Word we can have no experience worth talking about, no experience of His Spirit. Surely in America which has always been alive to God's transcendence, to His Sovereign Will—moral and redemptive—we can expect rediscovery of this in our schools. God's will and glory for man, for society, and for the world. Till we are sure of this and start with this, there is no salvation for us in sociology or science or psychology or history. All these are valuable as God's glory is kept first and His will put into them. Not God manufactured by creative education out of sociology, but a God creating man and society by obedience to His Word. We are not experimenting with God or creating God, He is experimenting

with us and testing us, calling us and determining the destinies of individuals and societies by their obedience or otherwise. Our faith in God is not our feelings, but our obedience. We must not start our social programmes and then bring God in as a means to carry them out. We must start with God, and in His Word progressively and finally revealed is His will. This is surely compatible with a real critical and historical view of the Scriptures.

Theology has too long stood helpless and seen its domain dismembered like the body of Isis, here, there, and everywhere, till we have lost sight of God and failed to hear His Word. We are seeing the breaking of a better day for it in America, for in spite of what looks like a 'cinematograph of chaos,' theology knows that God has spoken, and

without this Christian word of which Scripture is the norm there can be no true theology—a theology of the regenerate, and a theology for the unregenerate. It is to the Church—the creation of God's Word—that we must look for the apprehension of this Word and its application. The foolish cry of 'Not theology but life' must be given up as born of despair. It has already landed us in a life not worth living. We have had enough of the varieties of religious experience; it is time to listen to the Word of God. There is such a Word, full of riches and content. This is where Christian theology must begin, and beginning here it can in freedom—not as assumptionless or indifferent freedom, but a freedom of obedience to the Spirit of God—live and act and think.

Recent Linguistic Aids to the Study of the New Testament.

BY PROFESSOR THE REVEREND F. B. CLOGG, M.A., B.D., RICHMOND COLLEGE.

WITH the twentieth century there began a new epoch in the study of New Testament Greek. The fresh stimulus to such study was due to Deissmann, and the effect of the knowledge of the Koine from the abundant stores of papyrus discoveries was first made widely known in England through J. H. Moulton's *Prolegomena*—first published in 1906. It was clear that new dictionaries as well as new grammars would be necessary, and Moulton and Milligan in their *Lexical Notes in the Expositor* began what later took the form of their well-known *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (Hodder & Stoughton; 1930). The first part appeared in 1914, and the publication has steadily continued, despite the untimely death of Moulton, which left Milligan to complete it alone. Not only Anglo-Saxon but also Continental students have learned the value of these illustrations from the papyri and elsewhere, and will welcome the completion of a work which is already so widely used it needs no further commendation. The last part was published in 1930, and the whole is bound in one volume. Before Moulton and Milligan's work was more than half completed there appeared in Germany the first part of Walter Bauer's revised edition of Preuschen's

Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments (Alfred Töpelmann, Giessen). In 1928 this was finished and issued in one volume, a work admirable in its scholarship and arrangement. One can see at a glance when a word is first found, its use in the Greek Bible, and in the sacred and secular writers of Hellenistic times; and by a convenient system of signs it is made clear whether all the known occurrences of the word are quoted, and so on. As Bauer himself says in his *Nachwort*, the usefulness of such a book is its trustworthiness, and judged by that this book cannot be too highly valued. Even to English readers who are not always quite sure of the nuance of different German words, the references to the use of the Greek words are such as to make this dictionary invaluable.

Winer's *Grammar of the New Testament* was for long the standard work in its original German, and in its English translation by W. F. Moulton, until Blass in 1896 published his *Grammar*. But that was before the new era began. Although it passed through two more editions in the early years of this century, Blass's book was little influenced by the new discoveries. The great classical scholar, Thumb said, lacked the *entwicklungsgeschichtlicher Sinn*, and it was not until Debrunner began to pub-

lish his revised editions of Blass that the researches in the Koine were deeply reflected in the scope of the *Grammar*. The sixth edition of Blass-Debrunner, *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Göttingen), has only been published this year, 1931. Debrunner would like to have rewritten and expanded parts of the book, but the increase in the price prevented him. He has therefore kept the form already familiar, but marked in the margin the places where new notes are added, and the notes appear as an appendix. He has paid special attention to the language of the Apostolic Fathers, and enlarged the index of references to their works.

Another important German grammar appeared in 1911. The author published a second edition in 1925, considerably enlarged—Ludwig Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik* (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen). It has been well described as a 'Grammar of the Koine, with special reference to the New Testament.'

It has been left to a French scholar, F. M. Abel, to attempt a comprehensive *Grammaire du Grec Biblique* (Librairie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda et fils; Paris, 1927), which takes account of the study of the Koine, and is a grammar of the Old Testament and Apocrypha and of the New Testament Greek.

All these treat systematically the Syntax, but Blass-Debrunner is the most complete *Grammar* in the sense of placing New Testament Greek in the history of the Greek language as a whole. Moulton's *Grammar* aimed at that, but Moulton himself had only seen the *Prolegomena* in print before his life was so tragically cut short. Happily his death—an irreparable loss as it was—has not prevented the continuation of the work as he had planned it. Much of the second volume was in manuscript when he died, and W. F. Howard, who had been doing research work under him, was at hand to be entrusted with the task of completing Moulton's unfinished *magnum opus*. The two parts of Vol. II., containing Sounds and Writing, and Accidence, have been increasingly used by students, since they appeared in 1919 and 1920. The volume is now completed by the publication of Part iii., Moulton-Howard—*A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (T. & T. Clark; Edinburgh, 1929). This Part iii. is of special importance. In the first place, it treats

of Word-Formation. Abel and Debrunner devote twenty pages between them to that, Moulton-Howard nearly a hundred and fifty. Here is a scientific study of the formation of words which is not only of interest to the philologist, but of importance for correct exegesis. Moulton was widely acknowledged as a philologist, and Howard has shown in the section which he has written that he is an equally competent guide.

In the second place, Howard has written an appendix on the vexed question of Semitisms, in accordance with Moulton's original plan. No scholar would think of maintaining to-day that the Greek of the New Testament was Jewish-Greek and quite different from every other form. If there had been a Judeo-Greek, says Abel, we should expect to find more traces of it in Philo and Josephus. The results of Deissmann's researches led to the suggestion that there were few or no Semitisms—a view to which Moulton at first inclined. But Semitic scholars of proved reputation such as Wellhausen, Torrey, Charles, Burney, Lagrange have been for years examining the linguistic phenomena which seem obvious or possible Semitisms, and it was time a thorough survey was made of all the data. Howard has here marshalled all the facts upon which alone a balanced judgment can be formed. The result is the taking of an intermediate position between the two extremes. Moulton later inclined to this view, and it has the support of the continental grammarians. The question has long since ceased to be one of merely linguistic interest. Theories of sources are closely bound up with supposed Semitic influences. Howard's conclusion is that it is not possible simply from the number of Semitisms to discover whether the sources were Semitic or not; the style may be due to the author, who, like Luke, could write Greek at will with or without a strong Semitic colouring, and that though he probably knew no Aramaic. Enough has been said to show that Howard's scholarly investigation of Semitisms is a necessary and indeed indispensable guide to appraise the value of much source-criticism in the Gospels, Acts, and Apocalypse, such as many modern scholars are attempting to-day. And the completion of this Vol. II. is made the more valuable by some fifty pages of very carefully compiled indices.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

After Many Days.

BY THE REVEREND JAMES S. STEWART, B.D.,
ABERDEEN.

'The day shall declare it.'—I Co 3¹³.

EVERYBODY is reading, or has just read, or is about to read *In Search of England*. Now reading *In Search of England* has a queer effect on most people. After a few pages you want to get a pack on your back at once, and a stick in your hand, and a map in your pocket, and be off and away, over hill and down dale, wherever the winding road leads. And is there a purer joy in this world than the feel of a pack on your back at eight o'clock of a summer morning, and the road and the day before you?

Here is one thing the author of this book saw near Shrewsbury. He came upon a crowd of men digging in the fields. Every spadeful of earth, as it was brought up, was carefully examined; and lying all around were bits of red pottery, tiles and jars and bowls and bricks. They were digging on the site of an old Roman town, the town of Uriconium, built by the Romans who came over the seas to Britain in the far-off days of the Cæsars. One of the diggers pointed to a black stratum, deep down in the earth. 'That was Uriconium's fate,' he said. 'That is the mark of fire: the place was burned to the ground.' Five hundred years this Roman town had lasted; and then, away in Italy, Rome was attacked, and the legions in Britain were recalled, and the natives saw their chance, fell on the weak garrison left behind, destroyed the town by fire, and took the stones of it and built them into Shrewsbury near by.

And now all the Roman relics that have been unearthed are being collected. There are huge piles of bricks and tiles, made by the Roman legionaries themselves out of soft, moist clay. Among those tiles are some that had been stepped on by meddlesome children before they were properly set and hardened; and there, after nearly two thousand years, is the mark of a boy's foot on the surface, clear for all to see. You know what happens to-day when the painters have been busy on the railings in the streets, and have put up a notice—'Wet Paint.' Along comes a little girl

in the cleanest of clean white frocks, and looks at the notice. 'I wonder if it really is wet?' she thinks. And she just must try it to see, and out goes one little finger, and it really *is* wet, that paint, and—well, the clean white frock is not quite so clean or white now. 'Wet Paint' is a magnet. It is simply shouting for trouble! Something like that must have happened in Uriconium long, long ago. The Roman soldiers who were making the bricks were away at dinner one day, and had left a notice—'Soft bricks—not to be touched.' Then two small boys came. 'They certainly look hard enough,' they said. 'Let's try!' And they tried. They trod on one or two of the bricks, and they weren't hard after all: and there were the tell-tale footprints! 'Anyway, no one will ever know,' they said, and ran away. And now, all those centuries after, the footprints have come to light.

So we had better take care! 'The day shall declare it.' What about that poetry you are learning at school? Do they still make you learn *Tintern Abbey*? Certainly they used to. And *Tintern Abbey* has one hundred and fifty-nine lines. Now there are two ways of learning a poem like that. Either you can calculate out the lines you will probably be asked to say in class and learn only these: or you can learn the whole thing. Of course the first way is ever so much easier, and it may work sometimes, but—the end of the term! Your way of working is awfully apt to come out then, isn't it, on the day of the exam? It is the day declaring it.

Happily Paul's maxim works both ways. The good you do—that, too, the day declares. Dr. Laws of Livingstonia says that once out in Africa he owed his life to a Paisley mill-girl. A lion attacked his tent in the African forest, made one leap and then slunk away: and it was the girl away in far-off Scotland who had seen to it that the seams were well and properly sewn, it was she who had saved the missionary's life. The day declared it. So we must remember we are building now for eternity. There is a day coming, not here at all, but yonder, when every good deed will be suddenly lit up by the light on the face of Jesus. Isn't it worth while sticking in for that, worth any amount of present self-sacrifice for that? For the great day of Christ is going to declare it at the last.

Penetrating the Darkness.

BY THE REVEREND T. GREENER GARDNER,
BLACKBURN.

'The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light.'—Is 9².

'The people which sat in darkness saw great light.'—Mt 4¹⁶.

I should imagine that every boy and girl has at some time been afraid of the dark, and has longed with all their heart for a light.

Do you remember the first time you travelled through a short tunnel when in the train, and there was no light in the carriage? I once heard of an old lady who had to travel through a short tunnel—too short for the railway people to light up the train—carrying with her a box of matches and a taper, and when she entered the tunnel she lighted the taper. Well, a taper is not a great light, but it was a source of satisfaction to the old lady, for it helped to dispel the darkness.

Now whenever I think about light, I think about fog, and when I think about fog, I think about John Logie Baird, a Scotsman, the son of a minister, who is ever experimenting with light. John Logie Baird has had a great struggle with ill-health, and the consequent ill-fortune which so often accompanies ill-health; but he used his periods of enforced retirement from business to experiment with electrical equipment and discover things about light waves. By and by he succeeded in making it possible to send pictures across the Atlantic Ocean by wireless. I expect you have wished again and again that, when you listened to a singer from a Broadcasting Station, you could see her; or when Sir Henry Wood conducted the Queen's Hall Orchestra, you could see him and his orchestra. Well, all that is coming in the near future, and when we buy a wireless set, we shall buy one which will give us pictures of the artists who entertain us, as we sit by our firesides.

That is very wonderful, but I think it is when John Logie Baird talks of penetrating the darkness and the fog that he is most wonderful. Fog is a horrible thing, and darkness is unpleasant. Mr. Baird has discovered that by using the invisible infra-red rays, a person sitting before the transmitter in total darkness, where the unaided eye could not penetrate, could be easily seen by aid of the noctovisor; that even when the lights of a motor-car were covered by sheets of ebonite, so that the human eye could not see the light, this instrument could pick up the car three miles away and show its progress on a screen.

Even fog is not likely to be a terror to this instrument, and you do not need much imagination to realize what a blessing such an invention will prove to the sailors at sea in dense fog. Have you ever heard a sailor speak of fog? It is his greatest terror, for ships have to travel then without being able to see the lights of other ships, and they know that their lights cannot be seen, and there is danger of collision. Now there is hope that the noctovisor will be so improved that it will be possible to use it at sea, and that will mean that those who now have to sit in darkness in the times of fog, will be able to see the lights of other ships, and fog will be robbed of its terrors.

That is very wonderful, yet I believe that the darkness of which the prophet spoke was worse than even a dense fog, for it was darkness of mind and heart. Men were groping for the Light of Life, and they had not found satisfaction. But the prophet saw a vision of a Great Light, which would mean that men would no longer have any need to walk in darkness, for the revelation of God would be such that all would know how to live. Then in after years, when the Lord Jesus came, they remembered that this prophet had left this saying on record, and they were sure that He was the 'Great Light' who lightens all the dark places of life for us.

The Christian Year.

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Our Lord's Idea of Blessedness.

'And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying, Blessed . . .'—Mt 5².

That is the keynote of the mountain-preaching—'Blessed.' Not once, but nine times over, with most solemn reiteration, does our Lord repeat that word. He seems to be struggling, with all the energy of thought and language, to drive this great idea deep into His disciples' minds. They are called to 'inherit a blessing.' The gospel is good news of blessedness, now for the first time brought within their reach. So Jesus starts His preaching with a nine-fold benediction. 'That is indeed,' as Martin Luther says, 'a fine, sweet, friendly beginning of His teaching and sermon.'

St. Matthew gives eight Beatitudes, but St. Luke gives only four: in St. Matthew the form is general—'Blessed are the poor in spirit,' but in St. Luke it is direct and personal, 'Blessed are ye poor'; and, while St. Matthew's blessings are attached to inward spiritual states, St. Luke's blessings, in the literal wording at least, are attached to mere out-

ward conditions—to actual poverty, actual hunger and sorrow and persecution. Now, in the presence of such differences, it is certainly not unnatural that the question should be raised, Which of these two versions should we attribute to our Lord? And yet we cannot but think that the differences and the difficulties have been much exaggerated. It may be true that St. Luke's report is, taken as a whole, closer to the letter of the Saviour's utterance. It may be true that the Beatitudes in St. Matthew have been expanded a little to bring out their fullest meaning, and their original number enlarged by one or two sayings spoken by Jesus at another time. But there ought to be no reasonable doubt that the spirit and intention of the Saviour's teaching are preserved with perfect faithfulness by the first evangelist. Here, if anywhere, we should seek for the solution of our problem, What has our Lord to teach us concerning blessedness and the blessed Life?

Jesus Christ sat upon the mountain-side. And as our Lord looked down upon the throng, so anxious and fretful, so restless and impatient, He saw each single one of that huge company possessed and ridden by a vehement desire—for Happiness, Self-satisfaction, Blessedness. Yet none seemed to know what Blessedness was, or where it might be found. But all that there was to know about the Blessed Life Jesus knew; all that He knew He was prepared to tell. 'And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying, Blessed . . .'

But now comes something strange, something new and paradoxical. The Master actually proclaims to be the happiest of exactly all those people who were generally accounted as of all most miserable. Here was the Greek, entranced by the lore of sages, worshipping beauty and art and reason and the balanced intellect, making the highest good consist in a life enriched to the very utmost with all the varied treasures of experience and knowledge. And Jesus said, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit!' Or here was the Roman insolently proud and insatiable of conquest. And Jesus said, 'Blessed are the meek!' Or here was the Jew, wrapt in sweet dreams of national prosperity and earthly greatness. And Jesus said, 'Blessed are the persecuted!'

Is it not a fact that from the very beginning and fount of human history there streams, as it were, a vast torrent of conviction that blessedness is found in prosperity, in enjoyments long drawn out, in freedom from sorrow and pain and humiliation and suffering? Yet Jesus sat upon the Mount

and said, 'Blessed are the mourners!' All the conventional notions He sweeps clean away. In manifest defiance of the wisdom of the ages, in pointed contradiction of the traditions of the race, He says that blessedness inheres in that which all men shrink from as the ground of misery.

But let us look more closely at this teaching. What, in the first place, according to our Lord, is the cause or the condition of the Blessed Life? And, secondly, in what exactly does its Blessedness consist?

1. *The conditions of Blessedness* we find set forth with fullness in the first half of each Beatitude. And when we come to consider them attentively, we find that they are all of them just states, or modes, or aspects of a character. And therefore, on the last analysis, the various conditions of obtaining Blessedness resolve themselves quite simply into one condition; and that one condition is a character, schooled in humility, matured by suffering, instinct with gentleness and purity and love.

There was an ancient pagan once who wrote in his book, 'Blessed is he who possesses many goods.' And there are plenty of modern pagans who still reiterate in practice and opinion that same pernicious formula: 'Blessed is he who has health and wealth and fame and friends and a solid reputation and a fine establishment—who possesses many goods.' But our Lord says that this old popular pagan view is utterly false and misleading and absurd. It is character, and wholly character, and only character, that determines human bliss.

Can we sum up in one comprehensive word the quality of this character? The blessed character is the Christlike character. Take the Beatitudes as a whole: that whole is a representation of the character of Christ. Or take them singly; we discover some feature of Christ in every one of them. Was He not poor in spirit, who with infinite condescension 'took upon him the form of a servant,' and 'for your sakes became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich'? Did He not mourn, who 'himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses'? Was He not 'meek and lowly in heart'? Did He not hunger for righteousness, whose 'meat' was to do His heavenly Father's will?

And there is just one other point we ought to notice. This Christlike character, that makes for blessedness, is meant to be developed, not under ideal circumstances in an ideal world, but here, among ordinary, dull, depressing, unreformed surroundings; in the midst of sin and sorrow, in the

midst of every kind of evil and distressing influence. 'Our crown,' as the ancient martyrs used to say, 'blooms on the thorns which lacerate our brows.' But if this be so, then we and every one may be numbered with the blessed. The troubles that perplex us, our fears and our vexations, the dull, humiliating round of daily tasks and duties—all may contribute to build up in us that character. The way of the Blessed Life thus opens out for all. The gospel is in very truth a gospel for the million.

2. Now just as the condition of Blessedness is described in the first half of each Beatitude, so the *essence or content of Blessedness* is described in the last half of each Beatitude. The first of the blessings which our Lord proclaims is this: 'theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' And the last of the blessings which our Lord proclaims again is this: 'theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' The kingdom of heaven, then, according to our Lord is the beginning and end of blessedness—it includes all others. There is abounding consolation for the mourners; there is the certainty of victory for the meek; there is satisfaction for those that crave for righteousness; there is compassionate acceptance of the merciful; there the Beatific Vision enraptures the pure in heart; there the peacemakers are owned and recognized as the sons of the Most High. Thus every form of blessedness, adapted to every phase of character, is found within this kingdom. In the teaching of Jesus, the kingdom of heaven and blessedness are one.

But what can expound this figure of 'the kingdom'? One of the greatest of the German theologians explains it thus: 'it is God Himself in His power.' What more is left that we can seek or hope or long for, when God Himself is ours? Are we poor and needy? Then all the resources of God are placed at our disposal. Are we lonely, bereft, forsaken? The Infinite Soul holds converse with our soul, and breathes a comfort deeper than words can utter. Does trouble come upon us or danger threaten? Does the malice of men make us fearful and disturbed? Still God Omnipotent remains our refuge, and underneath for ever are the everlasting arms. Here, in God, then, is the goal of all our striving. Here in our sense of God the desire of the heart at length is satisfied.

This is our Saviour's doctrine of the Blessed Life. And down the centuries countless witnesses, of every country and of every age, rise up and attest its truth. We may listen to St. Augustine. 'Thou hast formed us for Thyself,' he cries, 'and our hearts are restless till they rest in Thee.' Or we may read the words of Pascal: 'Happiness is

neither without us nor within us; it is in God, both without us and within us.' Or we may take the saying of Goethe: 'To recognize God, wheresoever and howsoever He reveals Himself, that is true Blessedness on earth.' Or we may open our *Sartor Resartus* and ponder this sentence of Thomas Carlyle: 'Love not pleasure; love God. This is the Everlasting Yea, in which all contradiction is solved: wherein whoso walks and works it is well with him.'¹

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Christian Ideal: An Address to Young Men.

'Till we all come . . . unto a perfect man.'—
Eph 4¹³.

Supposing that the writings of St. Paul were introduced to us for the first time as a new document, and that we were to proceed to study them with the care and attention and freshness that we devote to a newly discovered treatise of Aristotle, or to a new fact of physical science, we would be astonished at the philosophic power and insight which are displayed; we should find that some of our most modern theories about human life and its conditions had been forestalled.

One of the great ideas of the nineteenth century which is often put before us as something very new, which, in fact, in the hands of a brilliant French thinker became the inspiring influence of a new religion, is the solidarity of humanity. To look upon humanity as an abstract idea binding together all the different races of the world, to believe that fundamentally, as man, Caucasian, African, Polynesian, are to be looked at as one, sharers in the same high destiny and working to the same lofty goal, burst upon many minds as a brilliant conception. Yet the full idea seems to have dawned upon St. Paul. His conception of the Christian Church was such that in its distinctions of race or language or sex were of no account, and at his time to conceive that was more wonderful than it would be now. It has taken many centuries to work it out as a practical idea, and it is still only very inadequately realized. It is an ideal which, fundamentally true, it is often hard to harmonize with the facts of life.

Another idea, in many ways equally novel, has its germs in St. Paul, and that is the progress of humanity. St. Paul, though his insight may be imperfect, has a clear idea of the development and evolution both of the world and of the human race.

¹ F. H. Dudden, *Christ and Christ's Religion*, 47.

He feels that the human race is still in the making. A new man has been created in Christ, but he has a long growth before him. In this passage he tells us that the spiritual gifts which have come from above have been distributed in the Christian Church so as to build up, in the unity of the Christian faith, in the knowledge which comes from Jesus Christ, the perfect man modelled according to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.

Man as yet is being made, and ere the crowning
Age of ages,
Shall not æon after æon pass and touch him into
shape ?
All about him shadow still, but, while the races
flower and fade,
Prophet-eyes may catch a glory slowly gaining on
the shade,
Till the peoples all are one, and all their voices
blend in choric
Hallelujah to the Maker: 'It is finish'd! Man
is made.'

The making of man, the building up of a perfect man, suggests a line of thought which applies to many questions which affect us to-day.

1. Most of us are anxious to form what we may call *our philosophy of life*. We want to know why the world exists, why we are placed here—we want to know what is the end and object and purpose of our life. We know that if we were to give ourselves up to philosophic thought, we might hope, at the end of our life, to obtain some shadow of the truth on one or two questions. But we are in a hurry, we cannot wait, we want to know, at any rate, something which will give us a rule of life. We think of ourselves, as Socrates puts it, entering on a voyage over an unknown sea—a voyage which may be dangerous and difficult and lead us to a goal which we do not quite understand, and we are ready to take any chart, however imperfect, which will help us a little in our difficult navigation. But let us keep this before us as the ideal of our lives, whatever they may be. We are helping to build up a perfect man. We are helping to attain the ideal of humanity. We may work in many ways and in many directions—some of us may be concerned with the physical, some with the spiritual, side of human nature. One, as a politician or a statesman, may help to build up the form and polity of a state; another may have to bridge the rivers and make roads over the mountains, to bring races of men nearer to one another; but to all alike the idea that they are furthering the ends of humanity, that they are building up the life of

nations, that they are helping to attain the ideal of the perfect man, will be an inspiring thought.

2. There is *the problem of education* which troubles people at the present time. We talk about it and we are spending enormous sums upon it, and we have a gigantic machinery erected for the purpose of promoting it, but when we come to ask what is the end of education and what education should be, we find an unfortunate diversity of opinion. Is it not possible that the solution of our difficulties might be in the ideal we have put before us, the building up of the perfect man? If we have that ideal we shall soon banish all those inadequate and one-sided and imperfect ideals which are continually before us. There are some persons who have no idea of education except as a means of preparation for earning a livelihood. There are many who tell us that whatever we do we must be practical. There are some whose ideal is one of pure scientific research, whose horizon is limited by the pursuit of knowledge. But man is a complex being; he is body and soul and spirit; and the ideal that we should have before us is that of the well-proportioned growth of all the different parts which go to make up human life and the building up of a lofty and inspired character.

3. Many people are asking themselves what is *the meaning and the purpose of a religion*. It has come to them, perhaps, in forms which seem to be outworn, and it has been associated, perhaps, too much with restraint rather than freedom; and they perhaps wonder whether after all religion is of much use. According to St. Paul the end and purpose of religion is given in the text: 'Till we all come unto a perfect man.' To him the purpose of religion is the building up of character. We are sometimes inclined to take too narrow a view of what human life means. We forget that it is not enough to satisfy our intellectual needs; we forget that, when the struggle of life comes to us in the future, it will be not our intellect only, but our whole character which will determine our fate—our self-discipline, our self-control, our tenacity of purpose, the strength and discipline of our affections and our emotions; and religion reminds us that it is our character as a whole that we have to fashion; and our Christianity not only gives us this as an ideal, but also gives us both a model and an inspiration. It puts before us the life of Christ, and it sums up the meaning of that life in the new Christian doctrine of love. It tells us that it is the jealous temperament and the sour disposition and the angry passions which mar human life; it tells us that we shall not get the happiness and the

good of life here unless that love or charity which has its source in God and is God's great gift to man penetrates every joint and articulation in our whole being. There are many theological questions which trouble people, many ecclesiastical questions which divide people, and it is right that we should turn our minds to solving these difficulties; and we cannot do so unless we have realized that the end of the religion which we profess is the building up of the perfect man. It is speaking the truth in love, it is uniting all things to the head, even Christ, 'from whom the whole body, fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.'¹

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

'According to my Gospel.'

'In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel.'—Ro 2¹⁶.

The English word 'gospel' is the Anglo-Saxon translation of the Greek word *Evangel*, good tidings, the good news of the Kingdom to all people. As Christ was the first great Evangelist of the Evangel it came about quite naturally that the word was used to express the story of Christ. Thus the word gospel was applied to a book in which that story is related. It is used in this technical sense when we speak of the four Gospels of the New Testament.

But the word is used in the New Testament in a wider sense still for the whole Christian teaching generally, the essential message of which the books are the record, and all that the message implies. It includes, therefore, the Christian morality and the Christian beliefs, as well as the facts of Christ's life; as, for example, when St. Paul, writing to the Thessalonians, speaks of those who 'obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.' It is in this comprehensive sense of the whole Christian teaching that the word is here used; for the statement which Paul says is part of his gospel is that God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ. It is not our intention to consider this particular item of Paul's creed, or to give a statement of Paul's gospel as a whole, but exclusively to consider the very striking phrase in which he calls it *my gospel*.

We might dispose of this unthinkingly by saying, what is on the surface and is of course true, that it is merely a question of the particular standpoint

from which it is viewed at the time. From one point of view, the point of view of the Bestower, it is called, as St. Paul puts it in this same letter, the gospel of God, and Christ's gospel. From the point of view of the contents of the message and its purpose, it is called the gospel of the grace of God, and the gospel of salvation. So from the point of view of participation, it is Paul's gospel. This is, of course, evident and true. But if we left the matter there as a sufficient explanation, we would miss some lessons.

1. From this phrase we might well learn lessons of *charity and humility*. In the written records of the story of Jesus we have differences and discrepancies that are insurmountable difficulties on any theory which leaves out of account the personal equation of the writers. According to Paul's gospel the truth took shape individual, not after the pattern of James. Each picture, because it was a true picture and not a copy, had its own perspective. We note at once the difference between St. John's Gospel and that of any other. It is the same as St. Mark's and yet not the same. It is the same incomparable Master, the same adorable Saviour; but the one narrative is unmistakably different from the other. The same is true of the first three Gospels, the Synoptic Gospels. They worked over the same ground to a large extent, with much material in common; but each is individual, with special characteristics, according to the writer's bent of mind, and according to the special audience he designed it for. We note, for example, the differences between the First Gospel and the Third: the one written for Jews, with special emphasis on the fulfilment of the Mosaic law by Christ as Messiah; the other written for Greeks, with special emphasis on Jesus as the Good Physician and the pitiful Saviour of sinners. Noting also how appropriate it is to speak of St. Matthew's Gospel and St. Luke's Gospel, we are helped to see in what sense St. Paul could speak of 'my gospel.'

The great heresy of the Church of all ages, as it has been the great temptation of the Church, is literalism, the worship of the letter in some form or other. It is responsible for all kinds of formalism in the region of morals as well as of worship, the ethical formalism against which our Lord protested in the Sermon on the Mount, which interpreted the commandments by the keeping of the letter of the law. In interpretation of Scripture also it is difficult to purge our minds of verbalism, juggling with words and texts, and never taking count of the great spiritual realities, the thought of which the words are but the garment.

¹ A. C. Headlam, *The Building of the Church of Christ*, 97.

The same unthinking literalism dogs our footsteps even at the very heart of our faith, the revelation of God in Christ which is the gospel. Men speak with censorious judgment of some as not preaching the gospel, because their ears have not heard the particular phrases which they are accustomed to associate with the great message of the love of God. They seem to think that the gospel means a set of formal propositions; whereas it is a question whether we can speak of the gospel at all apart from the gosseller.

Christian truth is eternal, unchangeable, but it is also relative and personal. It may, of course, be put down formally in a set of propositions; but here also the letter may kill, and only the spirit giveth life. The propositions may contain everything of importance, from the being of God to the scheme of redemption, all the things most surely believed, the things that cannot be shaken—and so these propositions may be fairly called the gospel; and yet it may be dead. Everything depends on the interpretation, the spiritual insight with which the heart of the mystery is seized and revealed. Christian truth is not formal but vital; a spiritual thing, and therefore personal. So Paul was able to say 'my gospel,' a distinct thing, different from any other man's presentation of Christ, his own soul's apprehension of the Saviour.

Thus, preaching is not simply the statement of truth, formal truth. If it were it would be an easier thing than it is, and could be without travail of soul and sweat of brain. Its function might then be served by repeating the necessary propositions. But preaching is truth *plus* personality. A man has to take the things of the Spirit, the things of Christ, and show them as he has learned them from his Master, no more and no less. Unless, therefore, we are so left to ourselves as to imagine that our knowledge and experience should be the standard and measure of all other religious experience, we will give up our attitude of censorious judgment. We will judge all things by Christ, by what is worthy of Him, as St. Paul declared that according to his gospel God would judge even the secret thoughts of men by Christ. If men are brought out of the bondage of sin into the glorious liberty of sons of God; if the Kingdom be extended, the Kingdom of righteousness and peace and love and joy; if Christ be preached, therein we do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice. Ought we not to be able to say this in the noble, great-souled charity of St. Paul?

2. But above all, the lesson of most moment to us is that *the gospel requires personal spiritual*

appropriation. In the final issue religion is personal—how the deep of God's love calls to the deep of the human soul. The gospel may be put down, as we have seen, as doctrine in a system of theology, to which may be given mental assent. Or it may be stated as a morality, a code of precepts, a teaching to be obeyed and carried into life. It may be expressed as literature, the story of Christ with the wondrous beauty of the ideal life, entrancing the heart and captivating the imagination. But essentially the gospel means the personal appropriation of the truth. It must be made our own. It must be a principle of life to us, the centre of our world, that by which we live. Paul's gospel will not save us, nor John's gospel, nor any man's.

When we speak of the gospel, the question is—What gospel? It is the one thing, the same thing, to whomever comes the vision of it, the revelation of the burning heart of God, the story of redemption, a message of love and reconciliation. But how do we accept it? In what sense is it our gospel? The life that we now live in the flesh, how do we live it? Is it an earthly superstructure on an earthly foundation that must crumble away at the touch of time? Have we simply left the higher life out of account, neglecting all spiritual interests, cutting our life off from any future and even from any reasonable purpose? Our gospel is that by which we live; and if we have no other principle of vitality but animal existence, what a death in life it is!

But in Christ the whole horizon widens and life grows richer, and the world becomes an arena which claims and receives the interest of heaven. To be able to say, 'The life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me,' is to be able also to say, 'My gospel'; for it is to be able to say, in spite of all weakness and sin, 'My Lord and my God.'¹

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Appeal from Tradition to the Witness of Experience.

'And know ye this day: for I speak not with your children which have not known, and which have not seen . . . what he (God) did unto you in the wilderness, until ye came into this place; . . . But your eyes have seen all the great acts of the Lord which he did. Therefore shall ye keep all the commandments which I command you this day . . . '—Dt 11²⁻⁸.

1. No doctrine of God, no abstract notion of God can in itself have force to compel loyalty, and to call

¹ H. Black, *According to my Gospel*, 1.

forth obedience. In the long run it is what life reveals of God, what life has contained of the Divine that gives God to us in the true sense of the word. And by life we mean just the ordinary everyday events that go to make our human life: daily activities, desires, choices, practices, ambitions, purposes, plans—our relationships with the world around us, our attitude toward duty, the way in which we fulfil our obligations, the motive which inspires our actions, etc. It is here that we have to lay hold of God, see Him, believe in Him, know and love Him. The only God we believe in, in the real sense of the word, is the God we find by living.

What is fire? Give what answer we like, define fire as we choose, we can have only one reason for not putting our fingers in it—namely, the experience that it is a thing that burns; and that is as good a definition as we need for the purposes of life. Similarly, the final and convincing reasons for believing God are those furnished by experience. We do not know there is a God until we find Him in life. We cannot be certain that God exists. Of course there are those who maintain by cogent reasoning that God is; there are many who declare positively and emphatically that God exists. But who is to know they are right? We can know in only one way. We must interpret life and consciousness, and find God there, and if we do not find God there He does not exist for us in any real sense. Religion therefore is not second-hand, it is not tradition—it is first-hand experience, it is a kind of personal discovery.

In the Bible we have a picture of God. God Himself is not in the Bible. We hear the sound of His Voice—and His footsteps, but it is only an echo—the echo of the voice heard by human beings. In history we read of a God who has been; but God is not dead—history is past and gone. It must repeat itself—God must speak to man all over again. Even the Jesus of the New Testament is a 'past and gone'—the Christ of literature is a dead Christ. He must dwell in the tabernacle of a personality to be a living Christ. 'Christ dwelling in you.'

2. God does speak to men all over again. Life is still miraculous. That is an elementary axiom of religion, but it is not easy to see God in life despite the fact that the God we see in life is the only satisfactory God for us. 'He hides Himself so wondrously'—but He is there all the same, if we look. The reason we do not see Him is not because He is playing hide-and-seek, but because we are blind. We can see God when we harbour

God. It is in life and nowhere else that He can be found. 'Your eyes have seen all the mighty acts of the Lord which he did.' We are familiar with the story of Israel's wanderings in the wilderness. To us it appears as a long-drawn-out romance of forty years' duration—wonder succeeding wonder—the Red Sea; Marah, Elim, Taberah, Massah, Hattaavah, Sinai, Pillar of Cloud, Pillar of Fire—one grand Epic; and Divine guidance, Divine assistance, all the way. But it is not one whit more miraculous than the journey of our own lives. To the children of Israel it was not miraculous, it was as commonplace as our own seems to us. 'Every ship,' says Emerson in one of his essays, 'is a romantic object except that we sail in—embark and the romance quits our vessel and hangs on every other sail on the horizon.'

How did the Israelites regard the miraculous wanderings? 'Forty years long was I grieved with this generation, and said, it is a people that do err in their heart, and *they have not known my ways.*' They were surrounded by romance but failed to see it. To the children of Israel the desert journey was a commonplace and wretched business.

But it is not the journey of life that is commonplace. 'All martyrdoms looked mean when they were suffered.' Think of the greatest—Calvary. Behold the bravest, most heroic, hanging on the Cross between two thieves! a sight not seen before nor since.

Towering o'er the wrecks of time
All the light of sacred story
Gathers round its head sublime.

That is the judgment of history—that is the universal opinion of mankind. This being so, surely all Jerusalem went out to witness the unique sight. Not at all. Three o'clock that Friday afternoon struck as usual—that first Good Friday afternoon passed quietly away without incident as far as the majority was concerned—only a few women, weeping at the Cross, only a squad of Roman soldiers, and a few priests in long robes and beards, and a mixed crowd of idly curious folk who had paced the street with nothing to do but crawl along to see 'another show' in the darkness of that tragic night. 'All martyrdoms looked mean when they were suffered.'

We are a 'blind race' in very truth. 'Verily, verily, I say unto you that many have desired to see the things which ye see and have not seen them, and to hear the things which ye hear and have not heard them.' God is always 'somewhere

else'—the great movements have happened in 'some other land,' to 'some other people.' 'Where is God?' we ask. 'Where is He not?' asks Jesus. 'Whither shall I flee from Thy presence?' asks the Psalmist. 'Nature is the vesture of God,' says the poet, 'the living garment of God'—another poet.

It is not the denial of the inspiration of the Bible that constitutes infidelity—but the denial of the Divinity of common ordinary daily life.

'And the manna ceased'—who said so? Is not the loaf which nourishes us to-day as miraculous, as wonderful as the manna of old? Think of the common loaf; through how many processes has it reached our table? A field was ploughed, harrowed, and fertilized a year ago. A sower in Canada, New Zealand, and other parts of the earth, sowed his field. The brown earth changes its colour first into beautiful green, then into gold, under the influence of rain, light, and heat. Then comes the bustle of the farm, of a gathering in of the harvest; the threshing follows, then ships leave distant ports, cut their way through the deep, arrive in Cardiff, Liverpool, London. The grain is ground into flour at the mill, and at last it reaches our town or village, where the baker turns it into bread, and we buy our loaf for 4½d. All that complex machinery has had to be kept going to provide us with a 4½d. loaf!

If thou hast wanderings in the wilderness
And find'st not Sinai, 'tis thy soul is poor;

There towers the Mountain of the Voice no less,
Which whoso seeks shall find, but he who bends,
Intent on manna still and mortal ends,
Sees it not, neither hears its thundered lore.

The rumblings of conscience are the thunders of Sinai. Have we not heard them? Does not the hard rock of difficulty, disappointment, sorrow, loss, pain, yield us draughts of limpid water? We are not strangers to that most common thing in the world, a mother's love. Is that indeed not a bush that burns and is not consumed? In some lonely experience, when we have felt forsaken, forgotten, has not the God of Horeb come to us, changing the whole scene, and giving us fresh hope? Has not many a stony place turned out to be a Bethel? and we have realized that 'God was there' and we 'knew it not.'

Henceforth our hearts shall sigh no more
For olden time and holier shore;
God's love and blessing, then and there,
Are now, and here, and everywhere.

'Look for the action of the Deity,' so says Sir Oliver Lodge, 'if at all, then always, not in the past alone, not only in the future, but equally in the present. If His action is not visible now, it never will be, and never has been visible.' And yet again, 'The interventions of God are universal and constant.'¹

¹ W. J. Rowlands, *The Suburban Christ*, 33.

Recent Foreign Theology.

French Theology.

THE number of commentaries on Job continues to multiply. Since Alb. Schultens (1737) opened a new epoch by his philological notes on the book, followed by Reiske and Schnurrer in the same direction, the literature on the subject has been immense. Now we have *Le Poème de Job*, by P. Bertie (203 pp.; Rieder, Paris, 1929), consisting of a translation, introduction, and notes. The author recognizes the plurality of hands which have given the legend its actual form; he discusses the Babylonian, Egyptian, and Hindu analogies, as proving its great antiquity; and he admits that

the text in some places is so corrupt as hardly to admit of translation. He is probably the first French scholar to reproduce in French the simple grave rhythm (*le rude mariellement*) of the Hebrew poet. On the whole, the Book of Job, strange and sublime, continues to hold its mysteries, but students who are seeking for a key, without wishing to grope through long commentaries, will have a good counsellor beside them in Bertie's volume.

It has been known for many years that, among the names in the commercial texts discovered at Nuffar (ancient Nippur), in Babylonia, there are many Hebrew or Aramæan ones. The texts, which

come from an important banking company ('Mura-shu and Sons'), and date from the reigns of Artaxerxes I. (464-424 B.C.) and Darius II. (423-405), were edited in three volumes by the late Professor A. T. Clay. It is not surprising that among the clients of this famous firm there should be descendants of the Jews exiled in Babylonia. Lately, D. Sidersky has carefully collected the names of these Hebrews and discussed them in a brochure, *L'Onomastique hébraïque des tablettes de Nippur* (Imprimerie H. Elias, Paris, 1929). The author arranges twenty-five of the tablets chronologically (from 437 to 417 B.C.), and translates them with the Hebrew names in italics. He also gives an interesting alphabetical list of sixty-one such names, comparing them with identical or similar ones in the Old Testament. It is a remarkable fact that many of the names appear both in the tablets and in the Old Testament with the same differences of vocalization, thus confirming the Hebrew pronunciation fixed twelve centuries later by the Massorètes. As the cuneiform writing includes the vowels, while the alphabetic Semitic writing (Phœnician, Hebrew, Aramæan) is composed exclusively of consonants (the vowel points dating only from the seventh century of our era), it is evident that the onomastic lists from Nippur are a valuable adjunct to the study of the Old Testament names.

The monumental work by L. Desnoyers, *Histoire du peuple hébreu des Juges à la captivité*, the first volume of which appeared in 1922—*La période des Juges* (431 pp.), has now been advanced by the appearance of the second—*Saül et David* (350 pp.; Auguste Picard, Paris, 1930), and the third—*Salomon* (432 pp., 1930). Since the time of Renan and Piepenbring, no French writer has attempted to deal satisfactorily and fully with Israelite history. Louis Desnoyers, who died over a year ago, set himself to the task on a large scale. His rare qualities and profound knowledge of the subject fitted him specially for it. The volumes contain a vast amount of interesting information on the topography, the localization of sites, and the archæology, as well as on the history of the Hebrews. It is worthy of note that he rejects the late date theory of the Exodus (1225 B.C.), and inclines to adopt the earlier date in the fifteenth century, a view to which many scholars seem now to be coming round.

The Septuagint, which is the most ancient of Biblical versions, has gained within recent years a new and increased importance. The question of its prototype has been a subject of frequent con-

troversy. In 1923, Franz Wutz, in a communication to the Congress of Orientalists at Berlin sought to show that a Hebrew version in Greek letters had been used by the Septuagint translators and he followed this declaration by several detailed articles in journals, ultimately developing it into a dissertation of one hundred and seventy-six pages. In 1924, Dr. Johann Fischer advanced the theory that the Hebrew manuscript used was written in letters which approached closely to the square Hebrew characters. Both views occasioned considerable controversy at the time among Biblical scholars. The whole question has now been treated afresh by A. Barrois in an exhaustive article in the *Revue Biblique* (July, 1930), where this Biblical scholar makes use of the monographs on the subject by Riessler, Schmidtke, Stummer, Margolis, and others. He concludes that Wutz's theory does not advance in the least the question as to the origin of the Septuagint, and only remains in the domain of the possible. He points out that we do not possess the authentic text of the Septuagint translation, but only later manuscripts, the most ancient of these being about six hundred years later, and that there is little or no evidence to go upon. 'We have not,' he says, 'in all the course of our study of the matter, come across a single case which would prove such a theory.' Therefore, we fancy, the matter must rest. It is unfortunate that we know next to nothing of the Septuagint in pre-Christian times. Its history is almost entirely its history in the Christian Church. The first individual who used it appears to have been a Hellenist, Demetrius, who did not live till the time of the fourth Ptolemy (222 B.C.), and the fragments preserved from Eupolemus and other pre-Christian authors are too small to do more than show that these writers were acquainted with it.

About two years ago two large volumes, *Ἰησοῦς Βασιλεὺς*, by Robert Eisler, appeared, giving a Slavonic version of the 'Jewish Wars' of Josephus, different in some parts from the Greek text. It is well known that the 'Antiquities' of Josephus (xviii. iii. 3) contains a striking passage on Jesus, which is regarded—correctly, no doubt—as the interpolation of some Christian writer, but, in the Slavonic version referred to, a much longer passage occurs (between II. ix. 3 and 4 of the Greek text), describing His activities, trial, and death. Eisler considers the Slavonic version to be the primitive text of Josephus, and endeavours to prove from statements in it that Jesus was a revolutionary against the Roman authority, who paid for His

folly by His life, and that Christianity at first was nothing more than a revolt against the Romans and the Jewish priests, and only succeeded because this first aspect of it was quickly destroyed. In spite of Solomon Reinach's vigorous efforts in his *Jean-Baptiste et Jésus suivant Josephé (Revue des études juives*, April, 1929) to sustain Eisler's ideas, the opposition to such attempts to discredit Jesus and the Christian religion has been very pronounced in the French journals. In the *Revue historique* (Nov. 1929), Goguel, whom Reinach admits to be *un savant justement estimé*, has shown the utter falsity of Eisler's contention. The Slavonic text, he maintains, is not that of Josephus and has no documentary value: it is a piece of Jewish polemic intended to prevent Jews from going over to Christianity. In the *Revue Biblique* (Jan. 1930) Lagrange has dealt with the whole text in detail, proving that it is an interpolation, and pointing out that even though we were to accept it as genuine, it gives no picture of a revolutionary Jesus, but only of a Jesus acclaimed by the multitude as the Son of David, to the discomfiture of the Pharisees, who denounced Him to Pilate and compassed His death. It is worthy of note that this view of the matter has been supported in Germany by Lewy (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1930, No. 11), and in the United States by Dr. Joshua Bloch (*Josephus and Christian Origins*, July, 1929), Dr. Zeitlin (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1928), and others.

J. W. JACK.

Glenfarg, Perthshire.

Varia.

PROFESSOR A. S. YAHUDA's book on 'The Language of the Pentateuch in its Relation to Egyptian,' which was reviewed in these columns (Nov. 1929) and which is expected soon to appear in an English translation, has created considerable stir among Egyptologists and Old Testament scholars. Its conclusions received a rather unsympathetic welcome from Dhorme in the 'Revue Biblique' for last July, and they have been bitterly attacked by Spiegelberg in a recent number of the 'Zeitschrift für Semistik.' To this attack Yahuda has made a dignified reply.¹ He takes up the various Hebrew words or phrases in the use of which he had detected an Egyptian influence, which Spiegelberg

¹ Eine Erwiderung auf Wilhelm Spiegelberg's 'Ägyptologische Bemerkungen' zu meinem Buche 'Die Sprache des Pentateuch,' von A. S. Yahuda (Verlag G. Kreysing, Leipzig).

denies. These are: עמר (Gn 41⁴⁰) and העמיר (Gn 47⁷), עם הארץ (Ex 5^{4f.}), נשק (Gn 41⁴⁰), the phrase 'in those many days' (Ex 2²³, and 2¹¹ LXX), Joseph's Egyptian name צפנת פענח (Gn 41⁴⁰), מִשֵּׁה as = *mw-se* ('child of the Nile'), און, חבה, and האִישׁ (Ex 2¹¹) as a title. He subjects these words to a fresh examination and re-affirms his original thesis. Incidentally he ridicules Spiegelberg's deduction from Dt 11⁴, that Deuteronomy cannot have been written before the overthrow of the Egyptian empire by Cambyses in 525 B.C. As well argue from the phrase 'Israel's seed is destroyed' that Merneptach's inscription comes, not from the thirteenth century B.C., but from some time after 586! All Spiegelberg's strictures, even if they were justified, would do nothing whatever—Yahuda argues—to shatter the main thesis of his book. Students of the Pentateuch will look forward to the English translation of Yahuda's book with eager interest.

The last number of the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*² is largely devoted to the Book of Isaiah. Budde deals textually and exegetically with chs. 1-5, Caspari with the text of chs. 34 and 35, Mowinckel with Deutero-Isaiah, and Elliger with Trito-Isaiah. The inconclusiveness of current Old Testament criticism is reflected in conflicting views of important questions. Budde, for example, protests against the view that prophetic oracles were necessarily brief—he maintains, for example, that Is 1²⁻²⁰ is a continuous utterance, with no break at v. 10; while Mowinckel argues that Deutero-Isaiah consists of independent utterances, each of which has to be examined by itself; and in a rather cavalier fashion he castigates Torrey for ignoring this in his 'New Interpretation.' Elliger, who had already defended the unity of Is 56-66 on the ground of style, now reinforces his defence by arguing that there is also a unity in its religious and theological ideas. Budde lets many good things drop by the way: he suggests, for example, that Is 1²⁹⁻³¹ originally began with הוּי and belongs to the 'Woes' of ch. 5. He also defends the conventional view of 1¹⁸ as a promise and not a rhetorical question.

König, discussing the legitimate religion of Israel, emphasizes the 'dominant' note of the Old Testament and points out that from beginning to end the aberrations of the so-called popular religion were uniformly condemned. Schmidt, dealing with Ex 15¹⁻¹⁹, argues that the songs of Moses (1^{1. 19}) and Miriam (1^{20f.}) are parallel, and that the

² Achter Band, 1931, Heft 1, 2 (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk 9).

intervening verses ²⁻¹⁸ constitute a liturgy, such as may have been sung in paying vows at a festival, probably the harvest festival. Eduard Meyer, who died last August, is represented by an investigation of three Phœnician inscriptions. Morgenstern discusses Beena Marriage in ancient Israel. Hoffmann contributes some textual notes on Job: in 19²⁸ he renders נָפְסוֹ וְנַפְסוֹ by 'which is thus destroyed.' The editor offers valuable criticisms of Cramer's Amos, Procksch's Isaiah, Türck's Pandora und Eva, Lods's Israel, and Unger's Babel. In connexion with the Messianic passages

of Isaiah he also raises and discusses the question in what sense the New Testament may be regarded as the authentic interpretation of the Old Testament.

With the current number this famous magazine begins its second half-century. It has rendered invaluable service in the past; and all lovers of the Old Testament and all who believe in the patient investigation of its manifold problems will wish for it long years of fruitful service.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

Contributions and Comments.

That 'Urgent Need.'

PROFESSOR P. DEARMER's article (p. 251) should bear fruit. I was one of that eager crowd that raced along to Paternoster Row, in 1881, on the morning of the issue of the Revised Version, and spent a shilling. I have always used it, and the Revised Old Testament since 1886, but I quite agree with Professor Dearmer that a new revision of the N.T. is needed. The last fifty years have brought such floods of light to bear upon the *Koine*, that:

What first were guessed as points, I now knew stars.

But why cling to the 'old splendid Authorized Version' style of language? The original New Testament was in the common tongue. We need to have the Greek common tongue translated sympathetically into the English common tongue—say of 1931. We who have fed upon the Bible since our childhood, and feel the charm of its very language, must consider the millions who speak our common tongue, write it in their letters, read it in their newspapers, and the current literature; but to whom the language of the Authorized Version is strange—men who say quite frankly: 'I do not read the Bible; and, if I go to church and hear it read, it does not appeal to me at all. It is not in my language.' With what zeal our missionaries devote themselves to the task of getting a grip of the genius of the language of the nation, or even the dialect of a tribe, into whose common tongue they want to translate, if only one portion of the New Testament. We too should spare no pains

to give our English-speaking peoples, to-day inhabiting so many lands, a Bible in their own homely language—the language that Jesus would use, were He in the flesh to-day, in London, Chicago, Brisbane, or Johannesburg; and that Paul would use if he were writing letters to our Churches.

The Authorized Version will for ever be a treasure of beautiful English; but the vocabulary of three hundred years ago is not the appropriate medium for the carrying of the good news of God to the hearts of men and women and children who live in a different world—the world of the twentieth century.

Professor Dearmer points out how little the Bible is known to-day, and that the advance of Biblical study has not reached many laymen or even ministers. How true that is. I am one of them. My ignorance is abysmal. I have been reading the New Testament in Greek, more or less, for forty years, yet I have to make the terrible confession that I never knew, till Professor Dearmer's article (p. 25, col. 1) told me, that the phrase 'Weeping and gnashing of teeth' 'is an editorial gloss,' 'a quotation from the Old Testament'; and 'an illuminating instance of the fact' that 'the Christian Rabbi felt himself justified in adding fiery touches from those Hebrew scriptures which he accepted as the very utterance of the Most High.' And 'the layman almost inevitably suspects one of special pleading when the fact of the interpolation is pointed out.'

Professor Dearmer contents himself with the 'one simple instance.' Alas! if it is simple for a layman, it ought to be for me. I have no excuse but 'Tell it not in Gath,' I have been a humble student of the Old Testament in Hebrew for near

forty years; yet I did not recognize the quotation, though I hunted high and low. I am ashamed to trouble the Professor, but will he kindly tell me where in the Old Testament I may find the words quoted, 'Weeping and gnashing of teeth'? Even in Westcott and Hort, the words are not in the special quotation type; nor do they mention the passage in their list of 'Quotations from the Old Testament.' Professor Dearmer says: 'Even the most conservative commentators now take it for granted that it is an editorial addition.' I have not met with those unscientific students who are so ready to take things for granted. But my collection of commentaries is small—perhaps 'such obsolete works as may float up on cheap bookstalls.'

(1) Of course H. A. W. Meyer is quite 'obsolete,' so I need not notice him. (2) A. B. Bruce in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*. But it is thirty years old. 'It is one of the heavy burdens of the prophet that he cannot be a mere patriot, or say complimentary things about his nation or his Church. ἀνακλιθίσκονται—Jesus expresses Himself here and throughout this *logion* in the language of His time and people. The feast with the patriarchs, the outer darkness, the weeping and gnashing of teeth (observe the article before σκότος, κλαυθμός, θρηνγμός, implying that all are familiar ideas) are stock phrases. The imagery is Jewish, but the thought is anti-Jewish, universalistic, of perennial truth and value.' (3) Here is another that has 'floated up.' W. C. Allen, in the *I.C.C.* on 'Matthew,' does not even tell me that 'it is a quotation,' or that it is 'an editorial gloss.' He appears to trace it to the *Logia*. I notice that R. H. Charles, in his *Eschatology*, p. 375, passes it without suspicion. (4) Alfred Plummer, in *I.C.C.* on 'Luke,' does not suggest the phrase in Lk 13²⁸ to be 'an editorial addition.'

Perhaps, when we make our new Revised Version, we may not find a majority to agree that Professor Dearmer's discovery 'removes from the sayings of Jesus a phrase that our conscience finds it difficult to accept or to defend.'

We Western moderns take many of the phrases in the Old Testament and the New, and in the Pseudepigrapha, far too literally. We ought to have known better. Our Greatest Teacher taught us in parables, and constantly used picture language. Do we really think that, supposing Jesus did use the words of Mt 8^{11, 12} 13⁴²⁻⁶⁰ 22¹³ 24⁵¹ 25³⁰, and Lk 13²⁸, He meant His hearers to take them quite literally? Similarly, in Lk 14¹²⁻¹⁴, does Jesus mean that those who have invited the poor to dinner here, will be recompensed by a good dinner

'in the Resurrection.' In that blessed state, even the sex relation ceases, 'they are as angels' (Mk 12^{24, 25}; cf. En 104^{4, 6}, 'Be hopeful, and cast not away your hope; for ye shall have great joy as the angels of heaven.' 'Ye shall become companions of the hosts of heaven.' En 51⁴, 'And in those days shall the mountains leap like rams; and the hills also shall skip like lambs satisfied with milk; and the faces of all the angels in heaven shall be lighted up with joy.') Are we to understand that Jesus is represented as teaching a Messianic Feast quite literally? Does He mean that with those who are as angels in heaven there will be, literally, eating and drinking (Lk 22³⁰), drinking wine (Mt 26²⁹). Surely the 'sitting down' (reclining) with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob 'in the kingdom of heaven' is intended to be understood figuratively.

The picture suggested by the 'outer darkness,' and 'the weeping and gnashing of teeth' is plain enough. It is bad enough to arrive at the quay just in time to see your ship sailing merrily away. This phrase 'the weeping and gnashing of teeth,' so often occurring in the *Logia*, expresses a chagrin, disappointment, and grief far more poignant. The very people who were most sure that they would be honoured guests at the Messiah's Feast, shut out in the dark! The kind of motley crowd, described in Lk 14²¹⁻²³, there instead. That is the danger, being left out. Is Lk 13²⁴ an editorial gloss? Then there are the five foolish virgins.

The phrase 'The weeping and the gnashing of teeth' needs no defending—it needs to be *seen*, a picture in words with a moral meaning. And we may be able to understand the picture even better, when Professor Dearmer tells us of its original setting in those 'Hebrew scriptures' from which 'the Christian Rabbi' culled them.

Many of the sayings of Jesus will be understood better when we study more closely, and with an historical imagination, the influences that made up the atmosphere in which Jesus had been 'brought up,' and in which He and His hearers lived. There are probably a good many 'editorial additions' in the Gospels, especially in Matthew and John, if the word editorial can be applied to the latter; but this 'Quotation from the Old Testament' must not be 'taken for granted' to be one.

B. VERNON BIRD.

Pembury.

Mr. Bird's proposal is, I think, a very good one. We do need a new authorized English Bible in the language of to-day. The difficulty is that, since

the eighteenth century, our theologians have not been writing great English prose. How pedestrian we all are! Robert Bridges and Clutton-Brock might have done it, with one or two others who are also, alas, dead. Who would retranslate the Bible to-day with the assured 'touch of the sixteenth-century men and the Jacobean?' Can it be that theology is more divorced from human values and the common culture? When I read of disputes about petty ecclesiasticisms in the papers, I sometimes wonder when we are going to become normal again.

Scholars and poets might do the work of translation together. The mistake about the Revised Version of fifty years ago was that the literary men were ignored, and most of the exegetes were not literary.

Let us get a Common Version going, and spread Dr. Moffatt's work. Meanwhile the even more urgent need is to get people together who represent the Churches, and to produce a real revised version of the old Bible. The vocabulary is not obsolete: comparatively few changes would bring it to modern comprehension; but I admit that the construction of sentences and the cadence are not modern. Why should not archaic methods of expression be changed? The most important blot in the sound of the Authorized Version, as one reads it aloud, is, I think, the excessive use of the words 'the Lord.' This is due to one of the few points about which the translators were not quite clear-sighted. They should have put 'Jehovah,' which is the last thing we should desire in a modern version, it may be. Perhaps when the meaning is that of the Almighty, the word 'God' might be used, to the great gain of the cadence; and then when a tribal deity is suggested, the word 'Jehovah' should be frankly used—as the old translators sometimes used it. Or, perhaps, 'Jahweh.' In any case, I would beg the reader to notice how much better the Bible would read aloud if the words 'the Lord' were less frequently used.

That is by the way. What I would urge is that we need a new Revised Version which should be the A.V. corrected, and that not with too timid or conservative a hand.

We also need, by the way, a Lectionary, a Bible for reading in church; and in such a Lectionary, unnecessary passages should be placed in brackets. For modern folk want shorter lessons, which is no doubt very wrong of them; but so it is; and many lessons are read to wandering and inattentive minds because they are unnecessarily long for present-day mentality.

Yet another book, you may say! But we do need to investigate all the possibilities.

As for Hell, and 'weeping and gnashing,' I fear Mr. Bird has not done me the honour of reading *The Legend of Hell*. He would have found the exegetical points discussed there. Roughly, when we find that one editor, whom we call Matthew and he alone (except for one instance in Luke, where the meaning is different. I have not room here to explain why I say this) uses a phrase, and adds it on several occasions, sometimes with a certain inappropriateness (Mt 24⁵⁰; see *Legend of Hell*, p. 244), to sayings which are without the phrase in other versions, it becomes evident that the phrase was a favourite one of that editor. He probably got it from such passages as Ps 112¹⁰, and there are many such phrases in Apocalyptic. In the same way, the undying worm is from the late passage in Is 66²⁴.

As for the opinion of modern scholars, I can assure Mr. Bird that he is wrong in thinking that my predecessor, Dr. Charles, thought that the words about gnashing are authentic. We must, of course, avoid the exegetes of thirty years ago, just as a scientist avoids pinning himself to the scientific books of a past generation. The very conservative commentators on Matthew in the *New Commentary* speak frankly of the gnashing passages, and refer to 'the eschatological language from which he (Matthew) seems unable to keep away' (*in loc.* Mt 25^{28ff.}). Writers cautious to the point of understatement, like Dr. Box and Dr. McNeile in their Commentaries, make, in less open words, similar admissions. So also Professor Goudge is a little cryptic again in the *New Commentary* (pp. 163, 528) when he says: 'For Matthew's formula in 53, cf. 7²⁸,' and perhaps a reader might miss the significance of the phrase 'Matthew's formula,' but later he is more plain. 'We should be on our guard in the study of Matthew . . . he sometimes gives an eschatological turn to words which in Mark or Luke do not seem to possess it, and introduces eschatological sayings when they appear to be out of place.' Professor Theodore Robinson, in another recent commentary (in the Moffatt series), says of Mt 13⁴², that the weeping and gnashing there 'is almost a refrain in the eschatological language of this gospel' (p. 121).

But your readers can look for themselves.

You ask me for a few lines; and here they are. But they are written so hurriedly that I must ask Mr. Bird and all your readers to forgive the inadequacy which is forced on me by the exigencies of the post. I wish I could have done more justice

to his valuable notes. But I do want to make it clear that, though our Lord used, in Mr. Bird's words, 'picture language,' He did not commit the psychological mistake of trying to frighten people into being good.

PERCY DEARMER.

London.

Text of 1 Kings x. 15.

THE passage informs us that the revenues of King Solomon amounted to the colossal sum of six hundred and sixty-six talents of gold per annum. In addition there were other increments to his yearly income which came from trading ventures or payments exacted from subject nations. The sources from which this additional revenue was derived are very obscure on account of the corrupt text of v.¹⁵. The M.T. reads **הַחֲרִים מֵאֲנָשֵׁי הָהָרִים**, and the LXX Version either found the Hebrew already in disorder or had a slightly different text, translating *χωρίς τῶν φόρων τῶν ὑποτεταγμένων τῶν ἐμπορέων κ.τ.λ.* So we have in the first clause of the LXX a reference to annual payment of tribute by subject nations, which does not correspond with the Hebrew. It is possible that *φόρων* might represent **עָנִי** instead of **אָנִישׁ**; yet that leaves **הַחֲרִים** unexplained. Elsewhere **הָרִי** means to seek out or explore, as in the case of the twelve spies or explorers, or mentally as in Nu 15³⁹ **אֲחֲרֵי לִבְכֶּכֶם**. The preposition is employed in a pregnant sense of seeking after and following their own devices. The sense given in the R.V. is therefore dubious. 'Beside (that which) the chapmen (brought),' a statement repeated in a slightly altered form in the next clause. It is possible that the Hebrew text suffered from early corruption. May we not see in the letters **הַחֲרִים מֵאֲנָשֵׁי** a reference to Solomon's fleet and the income accruing from its voyages? The historian writes of this fleet with naïve pride. We might therefore emend to **מֵאֲנֵי הַיָּם** or possibly even **מֵאֲנֵי הַיָּם**. In this way we should have the revenue coming in from Solomon's fleet, his commercial agents, and the peoples under his suzerainty.

H. A. WILLIAMSON.

Lochee.

Colossians i. 24.

THIS verse has given rise to much discussion. The translation in the RV is verbally accurate except for the rendering of the prefix *ἀντι* in *ἀνταναπληρῶ*

by the words 'on my part.' But it gives no clear meaning. I have also before me Dr. Weymouth's and Dr. Moffatt's translations; Alford's revision of the authorized version published in 1871; the translation given in Alford's Commentary, 1894 ed.; and Cremer's note on *ἀνταναπληρῶ* in his *Biblico Theol. Lexicon*. The first two translations appear to be mistaken in making St. Paul write in the first clause that his sufferings were on behalf of the Colossians, for two reasons. (1) St. Paul would probably have expressed this meaning in Greek by the words *ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν παθήμασι*. (2) His sufferings were in no special way on behalf of the Colossians, to whom he had never preached. Even if they had been, would it not be bragging in St. Paul to remind them of it? Alford shows by his note, 'that you may be confirmed in the faith by the glorification of Christ in my sufferings,' that he reads the words 'on your behalf' with the verb 'rejoice,' but the order of words in his translation does not make this clear.

A much more serious objection may be taken to Dr. Weymouth's rendering of the second clause of the verse. He leads men to think that St. Paul wrote that by his sufferings he was filling up whatever was lacking in Christ's afflictions on behalf of the Church, making it appear that he was being afflicted *instead of* Christ, that he was a substitute, relieving Christ of part of His afflictions. Dr. Moffatt's rendering, 'I *would* make up the full sum' is hard to account for. He does not attempt to mark the contrast in the Greek between the words 'filling up' and 'shortages.' Alford's translation, too, is not free from objection. He notes, in error, I think, that the words *ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου*, 'in my flesh,' are to be taken with the verb *ἀνταναπληρῶ*, 'am filling up,' but he does not show this in the order of his words. He takes, in error, I think, the words *ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ*, 'on behalf of his body,' also with the verb *ἀνταναπληρῶ*.

It is true, as Alford points out, that whatever a follower of Christ suffers, whether in God's personal dealings with him in sickness or sorrow, or in persecution as a champion or humble representative of the faith, he suffers on behalf of the Church, the body of believers of which he is a member, for his growth in holiness and for their growth in holiness as suffering with him. But instead of speaking of his own sufferings, St. Paul speaks in this second clause of Christ's afflictions in his, St. Paul's person, on behalf of Christ's Body, the Church. It seems that from their position, and for the sake of the sense the words *ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου* should be taken with the words which they follow, and not with the verb *ἀνταναπληρῶ*. To give the best sense the words *ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ* also are better taken with the words *τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. It is as if the Greek text were

τῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, indicating words dependent on the words τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ; the presence of the article is not necessary. I venture to translate 'I am now rejoicing for your sakes in my sufferings, and I am filling up one after another the shortages of the afflictions of Christ (remaining to be borne by him) in my flesh, on behalf of his body which is the church,' or equally as well, 'the shortages of the afflictions of Christ, on behalf of his body, which is the church (remaining to be borne by him), in my flesh.' Following Alford's view, the second clause of the verse might be translated, 'I am filling up one after another in my person, on behalf of his body, which is the church, the shortages of the afflictions of Christ.' But this does not give such good sense.

St. Paul regards the sum of afflictions, which he, like every other believer in Christ, is to endure before his death, and the sum of afflictions, which Christ is to endure in the Body of believers, His organized Body, as fixed. He might have written 'I am filling up the shortages in my afflictions,' but he bears in mind from Is 63⁹ that Christ was afflicted in all the afflictions of His people. As a believer he is in Christ, and Christ is in him (Jn 14²⁰). He had written in Gal 2²⁰, 'Yet I live, no longer I, but in me lives Christ.' He had doubtless heard of Christ's words, 'Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of these least, ye did it not even to me' (Mt 25⁴⁵). Had not Christ said once to him, 'Why persecutest thou me? I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest' (Ac 9^{4,5}). He had spoken time and again of all believers being one Body in Christ, the organized Body of Christ (Ro 12⁴, Eph 4¹, 1 Co 12²⁷).

So St. Paul wrote that he was filling up the shortages in Christ's afflictions on behalf of His Body, the Church, yet remaining to be borne by Christ in his (St. Paul's) flesh. The prefix ἀντι may be translated 'in (quick) succession,' or better 'one after another.' It intensifies the thought of filling up a shortage. Alford points out the meaning in the note in his Commentary. Every affliction of St. Paul filled up a corresponding shortage in the sum of St. Paul's afflictions remaining to be borne by St. Paul, or, as St. Paul put it, in the sum of Christ's sufferings on behalf of the body of believers remaining to be borne by Christ in St. Paul. He wrote, 'I am filling up these shortages by one affliction after another.' He implied that his afflictions were following one another in quick succession; in other words, that he was in much affliction, and that he was nearing the full sum of them—in other words, that the time of his departure was at hand. [He expressed beautifully as a matter of joy to him that every affliction borne by him filled up a shortage of the afflictions remaining to be borne by Christ in him. St. Paul's

afflictions are Christ's afflictions.] He gives two reasons for rejoicing in his sufferings: first, for the sake of the Colossians for confirming their faith; second, because he was filling up the shortages of Christ's afflictions on behalf of His Body, the Church, remaining to be borne by Christ in His member Paul. As Alford well points out, these afflictions have nothing to do with the vicarious sufferings of Christ on the Cross once for all for the sins of men. St. Paul said what the humblest Christian sufferer might say.

St. Paul, in filling up the shortages of his own afflictions, did not reduce the sum of afflictions remaining to be borne by the body of believers, except so far as he reduced the sum of afflictions remaining to be borne by himself. His suffering of afflictions was on their behalf, in so far as their faith was strengthened by his example in glorifying Christ. But when St. Paul, renouncing self and identifying self with Christ, chose to speak of his own afflictions as afflictions of Christ, surely he would also choose to speak of filling up the shortages of Christ's afflictions on behalf of Christ's Body, the Church, remaining to be borne by Christ in his (St. Paul's) flesh, rather than speak of himself in his own flesh, on behalf of Christ's Body, the Church, filling up the shortages of Christ's afflictions, thus putting himself into prominence in comparison with Christ. Those who would read the two clauses, 'in my flesh,' and 'on behalf of his body, which is the church,' with the verb, 'I am filling up,' instead of with the words, 'the afflictions of Christ,' make St. Paul write in a way unlike himself. They rob St. Paul's words of their holiness and humility, and make him a braggart. It was on this misinterpretation of the verse that St. Paul suffered on behalf of the Body of believers, the Church, in order to buy exemption from punishment which the faithful deserved, along with other passages, that the Church of Rome founded the doctrine of a treasure heap of good works, consisting of righteous acts of the saints, made available to the Church to grant to sinners. Out of this doctrine sprang the granting of indulgences. Alford's note is as usual very helpful. He writes 'Every suffering saint of God in every age and position is, in fact, filling up in his place and degree the θλίψεις τοῦ Χριστοῦ in his flesh and on behalf of His Body.'

W. R. G. MOIR.

Edinburgh.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.